The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 7, 1902.

The Week.

The *Evening Post's* staff correspondent in the coal regions undoubtedly gives us the real and secret motive of those who engineered the strike. They were putting their trust in politics. Their success two years ago in getting an advance in wages through playing upon the fears of politicians, led them to hazard a second attempt along the same lines. As before, they counted upon the good offices of Senator Hanna. He himself, in the remarks which he made to his employees in Cleveland on Monday night, admitted his peculiar relations with the anthracite strikers. Of course, he puts his interest in them now on the ground of his noble ambition to "bring capital and labor nearer together." Unfortunately, however, he does not clear away the suspicion that his activity this year, as in 1900, may have a political bearing. The way for him to dissipate all such doubts, if they are unworthy and unfounded, is plain. We would not ask him to live up to the Scriptural test of selling all that he has and giving to the poor, but he could at least make it certain that he is not yearning over laboring men for the sake of their votes. He could do it by saying unmistakably, as he has thus far failed to do, that he is not and will not be a candidate for the Presidency. He could also disavow any thought of making his philanthropy aid his political power, by resigning as National Chairman, and renouncing all idea of controlling the convention of 1904. Until Senator Hanna does in some such way leave himself free to work for the cause of labor, without any entangling alliance with politics, we fear that an incredulous world will hardly rank him with St. Francis or St. Dominic.

Judged by the published text of them, the West Virginia injunctions against labor leaders do but follow well-established and sound judicial precedent. They enjoin, that is, against interference with the management and operation of the mines, and also against attempts to deter employees from going to work "by menaces, threats, or intimidation." All the incitements to strike which the injunction forbids are specifically described as "unlawful"; and, of course, the statutes of all civilized countries prescribe penalties for any act that is tainted with violence. There is in all this, it will be observed, no denial of the right of labor to organize, or of trades-unions peaceably to persuade employees to strike. The right of persuasion has been upheld by leading decisions of the New York courts. Some of them are collected in a pamphlet recently published by Mr. G. W. Alger of the New York bar. He also points out that the Pennsylvania courts have taken a narrower view of the laborers' right to induce men to quit work. In one case, the highest court referred to the plea of the striker's counsel, namely, that the Union's committee had only exercised their "right to talk to new men to persuade them not to go to work," and roundly declared, "There was no such right." The court went on slightly to qualify this denial of the right of persuasion, by introducing the consideration of "an improper time," but the decision as it stands is certainly very stringent. It may yet play a part in the Pennsylvania mining troubles, should they be taken into court.

It is to be hoped that the managers of ex-Gov. Pattison's canvass in Pennsylvania will take their cue from the admirable address, devoted exclusively to State issues, with which Mr. Henry Budd opened the Democratic campaign in Philadelphia on Monday night. The "ills worth mentioning" which the speaker described, presented a formidable appearance, and it would be both interesting and instructive if some means could be devised to hold Judge Pennypacker and the Republican campaigners to the discussion of them. Such a course has always been peculiarly difficult in Pennsylvania. During the campaign of last year, when the principal issue in Philadelphia was the election of a District Attorney, the Republican speakers spent most of their time begging the people to "uphold the hands of President Roosevelt in his effort to carry out the plans and policies of President McKinley." Apparently the people were willing to tolerate talk of this sort, for the result was the usual Republican victory. Nevertheless, considerations of political expediency, as well as of political morality, urge the Democratic managers this year not to relax their efforts to force the Republicans to the discussion of the local issues. If they follow out the lines indicated by Mr. Budd's address, they must certainly accomplish something toward awakening the people of Pennsylvania to a realization of the political conditions which beset them.

A horrible scandal has developed at Philadelphia. It has been discovered there that when the City Council, about a year ago, gave away, without a penny of compensation for the municipality, franchises worth many millions of dollars, a clause was inserted by somebody with the evident purpose of safeguarding the people's rights in one particular. The details of this betrayal of the very private interests which "owned" the Council is shrouded in mystery, like most deeds of darkness. But there the clause is, in the ordinance granting the franchise. "Said motors," it says, "to be supplied from underground wires, or such other system as *shall not require overhead wires or poles*." Of course the first impulse of the Philadelphia officials and their intimates who are said to be "behind" the franchise deal, on learning of the existence of this restriction, was to find out the name of the miscreant who inserted it. Members of the Council who had previously borne untarnished reputations for "standing without hitching" fell under suspicion. But second thought is better than first impulse. It soon became clear that nothing, not even the enforcement of discipline, should be permitted to delay the undoing of the mischief. The City Council is to be asked at once to repeal the clause in question. Time enough to hunt the offender after this is accomplished!

"Devery, thou art translated," must be the secret comment of every Shaksperean in Tammany Hall, as he watches the antics of the ex-Chief of Police on the way to a district leadership. It is Devery's distinction to have thrown overboard all the niceties of the code under which he has been trained, to have so stripped off from "practical politics" the "human nature" that one may see the very bestial shape of cupidity which is the body of our political death. He has no time for the graces of district leadership, but imposes himself upon the people by the sheer glitter of money gotten in ways that he has never told, and which would not bear telling. It is Devery who pays the butcher bills of the poor, who yesterday settled the rent of several poor women—and told of it; who offers "pleasure" to the entire district; who, seeking a political office, makes not so much as a perfunctory appeal to political principles, being, in fact, profoundly ignorant of any political principle other than this, that the city is the politicians' cow, and that a place near the udder can be had only by purchase at a great price. What the answer of the plain people of the Ninth District will be to an ex-official with a malodorous record, who frankly offers to buy them up bodily with butcher's meat and picnics and the payment of their rent, we do not presume to predict. But we do not think so meanly of any portion of this city as not to feel that thousands of self-respecting citizens of the Ninth District must regard Devery with amazed contempt, and the rabble that he so easily gathers around him with unconcealed scorn. In any event, reform-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers can cheerfully put up with any translation of Devery that does not involve his silence and obscurity. He is to-day at once the most diverting, most disgusting, and most profitable spectacle that the city affords.

A pending transaction between the Mayor of the city, the consulting architect of the Borough of Manhattan, and the Municipal Art Commission is worthy of note. The case in brief is this: The consulting architect, Mr. Aiken, who is planning certain alterations of the interior of the City Hall, requests the Municipal Art Commission to pass upon the plans. The Mayor expresses pleasure in communicating the request, and says: "This building is so fine a specimen of architecture that I am anxious that no changes should be made in it except such as have been well considered and are believed by the Municipal Art Commission to be proper." But, some one might say, "This is only as it ought to be. No change should be made in a beautiful, historic building without the most careful consideration." The real significance of a transaction which, according to the letter and spirit of the City Charter, is merely normal, can be grasped only when one imagines the alteration of the City Hall under, let us say, Mayor Van Wyck. For Mr. Aiken seeking advice from the Art Commission, substitute Horgan & Slattery standing on their dignity as "city architects"; replace Mayor Low, with his solicitude for the beautiful building in which he serves the city, by Mayor Van Wyck, with his chronic affectation of boorishness and ignorance; finally, imagine, instead of the Municipal Art Commission, working for the seemliness of the city, a horde of sub-contractors and vendors of building supplies hanging upon the edge of the contract.

The plan of exchanging fellowships between Columbia and the higher schools of Paris—two Americans to study in Paris, two Frenchmen in New York—is important rather for the spirit in which it is introduced than for any large practical effect it is likely to have. It would be a mutual recognition of the value of American and French university training, and it would in some degree tend to strengthen the academic relations of the two countries. It should not be forgotten that holders of French fellowships have already chosen to study in America rather than elsewhere, so that the present plan merely gives official form to relations that already exist. To establish two more travelling fellowships in Columbia will have no very great effect upon the practice, constantly increasing, of pursuing higher study in France. If the French Ministry, however, should provide for two travelling fellowships for America, it would constitute among French students a kind of sanction and advertisement of university study in America. This would tend to bring them regularly to our graduate schools, where now their presence is exceptional. Such a result would be heartily welcomed.

Detailed statements about the United States Realty and Construction Company show that the scheme is even more comprehensive than was at first supposed. For the management of a general realty and building business, indeed, the organization is singularly complete. By means of its close association with other large financial and industrial corporations, the new organization will be able to buy its own properties, search its own titles, put up its own buildings, and dispose of the finished product, either *en bloc* or in the shape of securities. By its connection with certain large lending institutions, it will have unusual advantages in securing loans; by its association with the Steel Trust, it will be able to obtain the most essential building material on especially favorable terms—giving the latter corporation a monopoly, by the way, of a very important market. In the development of great properties, indeed, it is difficult to see how the new corporation can have any possible rivals. There are certain conspicuous building sites in New York which have been hitherto neglected for the want of a great and resourceful corporation capable of undertaking the task, but a corporation which is capitalized at $66,000,000, allied with leading financial institutions, and managed by the most expert talent in the field, would be able to cope with an undertaking of any magnitude.

At first sight only the financial aspects of the United States Realty and Construction Company strike the mind. But those who have marked the considerable advance in handsome building under ordinary conditions will see in this great consolidation, and those which are undoubtedly to follow, an opportunity by which art-lovers should be quick to profit. It is not merely that these enormous companies will be free to undertake building operations of a magnitude too great for private enterprise, but that, like all large aggregations of capital, they will be freed from the necessity of seeking a quick profit at the expense of a permanent one. If their managers are wise enough to plan for a long future, their activities will incidentally do much to beautify the city. That it pays to build well and handsomely is already generally recognized. But these great corporations will have exceptional facilities for good building, which they should not fail to utilize. Nothing could better guarantee the public-spirited character of the company now forming than the appointment of an architectural board which should see to it that, within the limits of cost and usefulness, every building that it erects should be an ornament to the city. It may be hoped, too, that in some cases these companies will follow the example of the Astor estate and open streets through the longer blocks, thus relieving the congestion of the city while benefiting themselves. It would probably be practicable to redeem certain portions of the town for better residence purposes, by erecting great apartment buildings with a liberal provision of open courtyards and small gardens. Certain quiet and delightful parts of the Faubourg St. Germain in Paris would serve as a model; and while there might be a period of waiting for returns, a few years would amply justify so bold an innovation.

President Schurman is performing an invaluable public service in discussing on all proper occasions our national policy in the Philippine archipelago. His address last Saturday before the Chautauqua Assembly should be carefully read by those who carelessly believe that the Philippine problem is settled. President Schurman finds that the war has united the Christian Filipinos in a common sentiment of nationality. With this sentiment we must deal with the utmost respect. To ignore it would be as fatal as it was to ignore Aguinaldo's incipient republic in 1898. Meanwhile, as President Schurman points out, we must face this alternative for the future Philippine commonwealth—statehood or independence. No one can doubt towards which solution statesmanship will incline. Nothing forbids the Republican party to promise by resolution of Congress eventual independence for the Filipinos. It will become a duty to do so as soon as the Filipinos have, under the Government now forming, proved a capacity for self-rule—an event which may be confidently predicted for the near future. A choice still lies before this nation, and that choice must be a right one—this is the tenor of President Schurman's clarifying discussion.

In view of his proper attitude in the case of Gen. J. B. Smith, it is cause for regret that President Roosevelt did not see fit to rebuke the court-martial which tried Major Glenn. That tribunal let off this chief offender among the water-cure torturers with a petty fine of $50 and only one month's suspension, while Lieut. Gaujot escaped with a fine of $150 and three months' suspension. As we have already pointed out, the President has no power to increase the sentence of a court-martial, and disapproval in these cases would merely have let the guilty officers escape without any penalty. But it was in the President's power to rebuke a court-martial which so flagrantly failed to guard the honor of the service by imposing sentences commensurate with the of-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fence. In the case of Lieut. N. E. Cook of the Philippine Scouts, found not guilty, the President did withhold his approval of the findings. In other words, he believes Lieut. Cook to have committed the crime alleged. But here, too, the President was silent. It may well be that he considered his statement in the Smith case sufficient; nevertheless, he has let slip a rare opportunity for improving the spirit of the army. It is interesting to note in this connection that, of the six officers thus far tried, three have been found guilty by the court and three by the reviewing officers, despite confident assertions that there was no such thing as official wrongdoing in the Philippines.

A question of considerable interest, in relation to the proposed Cuban loan of $35,000,000, concerns the prospect of floating such securities. The situation is peculiar. If the information cabled from Havana is correct, the bond issue cannot bear a higher rate than 5 per cent., and cannot be sold for less than 90. Now, a 5 per cent. loan of a strong government, sold for less than par, would be a very inviting investment. It may be that the rate and the discount would attract investors in this case. If the loan is really necessary, and if the prospect for its redemption has been prudently calculated, it is to be hoped that it can be floated, and it probably can. But the matter is not simple. The loan would have to be raised in New York city. It is almost certain that it could not be placed abroad. London is finding trouble in placing securities of its own colonies. It has lately had to withdraw from a market a British Columbian loan, already offered. Of Government securities now outstanding, bonds of states in high credit sell, to be sure, at a level which yields not more than 3 per cent. on par. But the question of credit is closely scrutinized. Brazilian 5 per cent. funding bonds sell below par; Chilian 5s, for less than 90; Argentine 6s, below par. It is true that the currency question cuts a figure in some of these quotations; but it is clear enough that, without a United States guarantee, the Cuban borrowings would be judged abroad in the light of experience with other West Indian and South American republics.

The revenue-reduction law enacted last April contemplated, roughly, $75,000,000 curtailment in annual public income. As the surplus revenue for the fiscal year ended with June, 1901, was $92,000,000, the reduction seemed sufficiently conservative. It probably will turn out to be so, though results for the first month in the new fiscal year are somewhat curious. To begin with, internal revenue, in which last April's cuts were made, falls $6,700,000 under last July. This is about the monthly average expected. But as against this reduction, the month's customs revenue rises $3,100,000 over 1901, and $4,800,000 over 1900. This offset would be effectual but for a third change in the fiscal movement—an increase of $4,500,000 in the month's expenditure. The net result is an unexpectedly large deficit. The Treasury reports that most of this increased outlay comes from payment on old State war claims. If so, the normal expenditure would be only a trifle over 1901, and for future months the rise in customs receipts and fall of internal revenue would be left to score against one another. We are inclined to think, however, that the increase in public expenditure, under the larger appropriations of the last session of Congress, will go on.

When Mr. Pierpont Morgan, five months ago, was explaining in court the reasons for the Northern Securities "holding company," he remarked that its $400,000,000 stock was an important consideration. The company would control the Northern Pacific, the Great Northern, and the Burlington, and, Mr. Morgan added, "it is not within the range of human probabilities that any single interest will be able to buy the control of the Northern Securities Company away from its present owners." This was a logical proposition; its practical working out, moreover, involved merely the issue of new shares for old. The Burlington purchase at 200, to be sure, was extravagant, and the issue of bonds to pay for it was an exceedingly dangerous example. But, as to this, Mr. Morgan testified that the price was paid "because we could not get the control at any lower figure." The Rock Island project, now officially set forth, shows that the theories of our capitalists to-day have drifted as far from Mr. Morgan's position of last March as that position had moved from the original "community-of-interest" plan. Where Mr. Morgan's plan contemplated companies whose control would be so costly that no one could pay the price, the new idea looks to a company whose control will be so cheap that its present owners can keep it for a trifle. In the famous Northern Pacific contest, a majority of the company's $150,000,000 stock was actually purchased, costing some $78,000,000; but Mr. Morgan thought that half of the $400,000,000 Northern Securities would not easily be purchased. Control of Rock Island, as acquired by the present ruling party, is thought to have cost some $45,000,000; but, with the present fixing of virtual control in $54,000,000 new preferred shares, which will sell at a heavy discount, the same interests can probably keep control through the use of barely $16,000,000.

It is not so long ago that Mr. G. K. Chesterton, or some other commentator of British society, was writing on the lack of originality in millionaires, and the subject has been again treated in the "Contributors' Club" of the last *Atlantic*. Naturally, Mr. Carnegie and his perennial gifts of libraries were more or less in mind, and served as the butt of certain good-natured shafts. It was not wholly safe, even at the height of his library activities, to cite Mr. Carnegie as an awful example of a rich man in a rut, and it now appears that originality may be displayed even in the giving of libraries. Certainly it is a graceful thing to give the books which Lord Acton enriched by his marginalia to that man in England who is best fitted to use them to his own and the common profit; and when this vast collection in mediæval history finally passes into some public library, it will come with enhanced associations from the fact that, through Mr. Carnegie's courtesy, John Morley fell heir to the books and literary materials of Lord Acton. It is seldom given to be generous with this grace, and that year will be memorable in the annals of graceful giving which saw the timely purchase of the poet Carducci's books by the Queen Dowager of Italy and the transfer of Lord Acton's library to Mr. John Morley.

Another bye-election has gone against the English Government, and so unexpectedly and with such a staggering reversal of majorities as to amount to a political disaster. North Leeds has been Conservative since 1880. It was put down as the safest of safe seats, the Tory majority in the last general election being 2,500. Now the Liberals have won it by more than 700. Moreover, they fought their campaign on what the Imperialists would call the most miserable of parochial issues—the Education Bill (which the Government has given too much the appearance of class favoritism) and free trade. Lord Rosebery's saying that the victory should be a warning to the Liberals not to support Irish Home Rule, was a singularly ill-chosen comment on it. The fact was, that the Liberal candidate, Mr. Barran, had for some time avoided in his canvass all mention of the Irish question, but at last, under pressure from his constituency, had declared himself in favor of the historic Gladstonian policy. But for this, and the winning of the Irish vote, it was thought he could not possibly have been elected. It would be a queer thing, then, for Rosebery and his Imperial League to meet to congratulate the new member, and improve the occasion to denounce the programme on which he secured his triumph. For the rest, Lord Rosebery's speech seems to have been rather a darkening of Liberal counsels, and a quite unnecessary and ill-timed insistence upon the things that divide a party in great need of being united.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IOWA AND TARIFF REFORM.

The Republican State Convention held last week at Des Moines, Iowa, has excited a national interest by reason of the lively controversy which preceded and attended its meeting, as to the attitude which it should take toward the tariff question. Albert B. Cummins, a representative of the younger generation of politicians, as compared with Senator Allison and other veteran party leaders, was elected Governor, last year, upon a platform which recognized the necessity of tariff reform and demanded the requisite legislation. After declaring adherence to "the historic policy" of the party in giving protection to American industry, and "pointing with pride" to its vindication in the extraordinarily rapid development of our national resources ascribed to this policy, the resolutions of 1901 proceeded to affirm that "we favor such changes in the tariff from time to time as may become advisable through the progress of our industries and their changing relations to the commerce of the world." This was followed by an endorsement of reciprocity as "the natural complement of protection," and a call for its development as necessary to the realization of our highest commercial possibilities; and then came a plain-spoken demand for "any modification of the tariff schedules that may be required to prevent their affording shelter to monopoly."

Last year was an "off year" in our politics, only a very few States keeping Iowa company in the choice of a Governor, and no national officials being elected. This year the lower branch of Congress is to be elected, and a number of States will choose Legislatures which must in turn name members of the Senate. Moreover, the Congressional election which comes midway in a Presidential term is regarded by many politicians as "the opening gun" for the national campaign, two years later. In 1901, therefore, the question which was raised by the Iowa Republicans in their tariff deliverance was largely academic, while in 1902 it is a matter of practical importance how they stand on an issue that will surely be raised in the Congress to which the other forty-four States as well as Iowa elect Representatives. It is a long time since there has been a more vigorous contest in any commonwealth as to the position which the party should take on a question not only of concern to the nation, but having a bearing on the relations of the party in one State to the organization as a whole.

Practically, the issue came down to this, whether the Republicans of Iowa ought to declare themselves in favor of such a revision of the tariff as would remove its shelter to Trusts, or ought to ignore the whole question. The division was not strictly along lines of age, but, as a rule, the older leaders, like Senator Allison and Speaker Henderson, favored a policy of silence, while most of the younger generation, represented by Gov. Cummins and Mint Director Roberts, who now controls the leading party organ, advocated a reaffirmation of the resolutions adopted last year. It was urged, on the one side, that a State Convention ought not to attempt to make national platforms for the party, but an appeal to the records showed that, a quarter of a century ago, in 1877, when the financial issue was burning, Iowa Republicans expressly demanded the resumption of specie payments. It was also argued by the conservatives that the resolution in question was virtually a plea of guilty to the Democratic charge that the tariff is the parent of Trusts; but the progressives replied that the language expressed the exact views of a large majority of the party, that it had stood the test of one campaign, and that its elimination would make it an issue in this year's campaign, put the party on the defensive, and lead the people to believe that the party was changing front on the Trust question. The fight was waged with great vigor in the Committee on Resolutions, but, when the opponents of tariff reform had been beaten there, they concluded to surrender, and not a voice was raised in opposition to the platform when it was reported to the Convention.

It is interesting to note that in this action there is a reversion on the part of Iowa Republicanism, under new leadership, towards the position on the tariff which was occupied by the party in the same State twenty-five years ago. When the late John H. Gear (afterwards Senator) was first elected Governor in 1877, he stood upon a platform which declared that "we favor a wisely adjusted tariff for revenue"; and this resolution was adopted without change by the convention of 1878—a year of Congressional elections—as well as by that of 1879, when Mr. Gear was nominated for a second term. Mr. Allison, then in middle life, and serving the first of his five terms in the Senate, was in sympathy with this attitude, and nobody questioned the orthodoxy of any Republican who held such views. Gov. Cummins and his school may therefore claim that they are only following in the footsteps of their fathers.

The action of the Iowa convention would be significant and encouraging if the Des Moines platform stood by itself as an index of Republican sentiment in the Middle West. But there is abundant evidence that a host of Republicans throughout that section agree with their Iowa brethren in this matter. If the recent Wisconsin convention had been allowed by the party dictator to express its views on national questions, it would undoubtedly have shown its sympathy with the demand for tariff reform, but Gov. La Follette insisted that the campaign should be made on State issues. Even some Republican leaders of the older generation openly and earnestly favor such a declaration of principles as the Iowa convention has made. The veteran Senator Cullom of Illinois told the *Tribune* correspondent in Washington last week that he believed the Iowa expression "just about voices the sentiment of the Republican masses throughout the West," adding: "I know it is the way the Republicans of my State feel, and I am convinced that, the sooner we take this matter up and dispose of it, the better it will be for the country and the party."

The *Tribune*, to be sure, in its editorial columns attempts to minimize the importance of the Iowa plank by emphasizing the fact that it was only a repetition of a declaration which made no great stir a year ago; but its Washington correspondent is more candid in admitting that this circumstance "does not detract from the importance of the action from the point of view of party leaders here." The same authority represents the movement as of vital importance in at least three Congressional districts of Iowa, which are now represented by Republicans who opposed "reaffirming" last year's deliverances at Des Moines, and who say they will not make their own campaigns on any tariff-revision platform. It does not need the evidence which other newspapers furnish from all parts of the country to show that shrewd politicians recognize the action just taken in Iowa as highly important.

MR. BABCOCK RECANTS.

Seldom can a public man have more unblushingly advertised his own inconsistency and insincerity than has Congressman Babcock, in the statement which, as Chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, he gave to the press in Washington on July 30. He not only swallowed his own words and spit upon his own acts, but went out of his way to do it, and gloried in trampling upon his own record. "There is only one thing worse than the cant of politics," said Lord John Russell on a certain occasion, "and that is the recant." Mr. Babcock has recanted, and has added to that humiliation by appearing to be unconscious of his own shame. It is not every prominent man who can thus cheerfully give the world the option of believing him either knave or fool.

The melancholy details of Mr. Babcock's moral suicide can be briefly given. He comes out, like a master of jeers and flouts, with ridicule of the Democratic contention that tariff protection should be removed from manufactured goods which are sold cheaper abroad than at home. What if they are? asks Congressman Babcock airily. It is only "a rule of the trade," he says, that surplus products must go cheaper to the foreigner. The Democrats can make nothing of that issue. "We are not afraid to ask the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country to continue the Republican party in power in order that those policies [the present tariff] may be continued in effect." But if he was not afraid of that, did he not dread that his own previous attitude and language would be thrown in his teeth? Who was it that was making all the row last winter about removing needless and abused protective duties? Congressman Babcock. Who made himself so offensive on this subject to the party leaders that Speaker Henderson was urged to keep him off the Committee on Ways and Means? Mr. Babcock. Who introduced a bill to take off the tariff from iron and steel products, spoke for it, voted for it, divided the Ways and Means Committee on it, boasted of it, swore he would never abandon it, vowed that the party would be defeated if it rejected the measure? Why, this same Joseph W. Babcock!

Almost exactly a year ago he was expounding his unalterable convictions to the editor of the *Southwestern Wisconsin* which published his letter. "I maintain," declared the then valiant Babcock, "that it is a part of the policy of protection to protect the consumer." He explained precisely what he meant: "We can to-day produce and undersell the world. Shall we continue a tariff on articles that are, in fact, articles of export? If Congress maintains a tariff on such articles, the whole theory of protection falls to the ground, and it simply inures to the benefit of those who may secure the control of any such commodity, *since by its aid they can fix exorbitant prices in the domestic market.*" Then, with a swell of indignant virtue in his voice, Mr. Babcock asked, "How can such a policy be defended?" Well, he has answered his own question. Get yourself elected chairman of the campaign committee, show how beautifully "holler" you are fashioned in order to "swaller" with ease your own principles, and you can defend with moral vehemence this or any other policy which you have previously denounced as infamous. D'Azeglio explained the process in the case of the Carbonaro who was asked to break his oath: "Eccellenza, I cannot; it is impossible. . . . You understand, I have taken an oath—give me at least another ducat!"

Mr. Babcock's sad case is worth dwelling upon because he illustrates, in his not very important personality, the too common recklessness of American politicians in pitching their character out of the window. They seem to think that stability and unshaken honesty are of absolutely no value in politics. To acquire a reputation for sobriety and courage and independence seems to be often their aim for a time, as it was apparently Mr. Babcock's; but when the crucial day comes, they throw it away, as he has done, with incredible indifference, and the most coolly insolent assumption that the public will not perceive anything amiss, or will not care if it does. But this is really an insult to the people which they have never been slow to resent. They will not fail to do so, we believe, whenever the occasion fairly offers. Unless the whole American nation is to become a mere weather-cock like the frivolous Babcock, it will remain in its old choice of solidity and consistency and clear honesty in the men whom it delights to honor.

The affair runs beyond the mere person of the unfortunate Babcock in another particular. It shows the bottomless hypocrisy of the pretence of the Republican party that it will, all in good time, and if only let alone, reform the tariff itself. All its talk in that vein has been uniformly and historically hollow. Not one of its party platforms has, in this matter, been able to sustain the weight of a single campaign. Always, as we see again to-day, the stirrings of Democratic opposition, or mutterings within the ranks of the Republican party itself, only lead the protectionist Old Man of the Sea to grip the Republican neck with a more strangling clutch. We shall never see tariff abuses made an end of until an impulse comes from those who suffer from tariff corruption, not from those who profit by it in both pocket and politics. Congressman Babcock's indecent retreat from his own position shows that there will have to be an exterior force, a *vis a tergo*, applied, before Americans may hope to have the monstrosities of their tariff shorn away.

THE HANDICAP OF MILITARISM.

That the Czar has not abandoned his hope of bringing about partial disarmament in Europe, is asserted in a recent dispatch from Rome. It explains that the late visit of the King of Italy to St. Petersburg led to an exchange of views on the possibility of an international agreement for reducing European armaments. The same subject, it is further stated, will be discussed by the Emperor William and King Victor when the latter makes his approaching journey to Berlin. What the European Powers are said to be more and more clearly perceiving is that the modern world is an industrial world, not a fighting world; that the race is to the nation which, other things being equal, carries the lightest burden of taxation; and that the risk of a war on the Continent is now so slight that the crushing military expenditures of the several countries may be cut down in a way to enable them to face with more composure "the American peril"—that is, a trade invasion by the United States.

We do not accept these reports for gospel truth. There is doubtless in them much drawing the bow at a venture. Europe will not disarm to-morrow, nor the day after. But if her rulers are not openly saying that their peoples are staggering under too great a weight of militarism, in the struggle for commercial supremacy, they are saying it privately; if they are not thinking about this evil as one which threatens public peace and content, they ought to be. King Victor is said to be a monarch of clear eyes and progressive ideas; how, then, can he fail to reflect often on the ruinous taxes which drive so many of Italy's sons over-seas every year to escape the misery that overwhelms them at home? With the military budget cut down one-half or more, the forced exile of Italians would not be what we see it. And if the autocratic rulers of Russia did not feel themselves compelled by military necessity to wring taxes from the wretched peasantry who spend their lives but one step from starvation, no one can doubt that they would find the task of government made immensely easier.

The thing that comes home to an American with sardonic force, in all this talk of Europe's shaking her toilers free of the traditional soldier strapped on the back of each of them, is that we are preparing to load ourselves down with the same burden, at the very moment that our industrial rivals over the ocean are planning to get rid of it. But a few days ago we had a long and half-official account from Washington of the scheme to use the "war game," about to be played by army and navy near this city, and especially the great concentration of the fleet in West Indian waters next winter, as a means of whipping Congress into granting "big appropriations." We must have a much stronger navy, is the cry of the War College; and to make the matter precise, we are informed that our leading "scholar" in strategics is convinced that we shall have a war with Germany in 1907—that is, unless we make our navy so powerful that Germany will not dare to attack us. This "thoughtful officer" observes that the maximum of the German shipbuilding programme will be attained five years from now; it has been revealed to him that Germany will about that time make a dash for the Dutch islands in the Caribbean; and accordingly he declares it our immediate duty to get ready a navy able to frighten off the Kaiser's strongest.

This particular bit of naval metaphysics has its amusing side. Nothing shows the officer in question to be more truly "thoughtful" than the care with which he singled out his antagonist. Does the thoughtless reader suppose he had any special enmity against Germany? Not the least in the world. It simply happens that the German navy, as planned, is the next above ours in strength. It is, therefore, the one we must first surpass. Hence this transcendental speculation about the coming war with Germany. Why did not the prophetic soul of the "thoughtful officer,"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brooding on wars to come, predict one with France, or even Great Britain? We make few pretensions ourselves to alarmist "thought" of this kind, but we would undertake to point out an even greater likelihood of a clash with the French or British navy than with the German. But, don't you see? if we were to call upon Congress at once for as many battleships as France or England has, the people would take alarm, and the whole game would be given away. So we must restrict our gaze for the present to merely the next strongest naval Power, and get up a scare about the others later.

The whole question of the connection between heavy military expenditure and heavy taxation, and between heavy taxation and a handicapped trade and discontent and revolution, had its classic discussion and its correct settlement in England between 1845 and 1860. It was not only the free lance, Cobden, but the responsible Minister, Sir Robert Peel, who laid down the true principles in this business. He bluntly repudiated the lying old maxim, "If you wish peace, prepare for war." His reasons were two: If a Government were to listen to the advice and warnings of military experts, even the most overwhelming taxation would not produce money enough, and the people would be driven to desperation. More than that, Sir Robert boldly said, it is "impossible to secure a country against all conceivable risks." Risk must be run. Peaceful nations cannot go about armed to the teeth because it is possible some mad aggressor may wickedly attack them, any more than the average citizen is in duty bound to carry sword and revolver to repel a barely possible assault by a highwayman. We have to be guided by reason and probability; and reason and probability are dead against overburdening an industrial nation with taxes that may be unnecessary, and that are certain to disable it in competition for the world market.

It was this practical consideration, mainly, that made Cobden a lover of peace. To free industry from the shackles of militarism was his dream and aim. This was why he said that he should "die happy" if he could feel "the satisfaction of having in some degree contributed to the partial disarmament of the world." Now, is it not a perverse thing, a very irony of fate, that free America, just emerging into the sight of the world as the greatest manufacturing and exporting nation, should voluntarily handicap herself in this way? Already we spend $78,000,000 a year on our navy—more than three times its annual cost ten years ago. Must this vast sum be doubled? To guard ourselves against remote and speculative dangers, must we throw away our great opportunity for the present industrial conquest of the world? If we do, under the persuasion of our military theorists, we shall be guilty of an act of national folly unparalleled in history.

THE TEACHING OF ART IN UNIVERSITIES.

The announcement of the proposed formation of a Department of Fine Arts by Columbia University, and the highly interesting comments thereon of Mr. Russell Sturgis, in an open letter to President Butler, dated June 10, bring up for discussion by others the whole question of the teaching of art in universities. How much and what kind of instruction in the arts of design should be attempted by the university? That some such instruction should be attempted, we may take for granted all agree. It has been one of the greatest weaknesses of education in the past that it has been too exclusively literary, so that the most highly educated have often been men for whom the arts of design scarcely existed; men who, if they troubled themselves at all about such arts, entirely and profoundly misunderstood them, and misconceived their purpose and methods. The self-made millionaire has, at least in English-speaking countries, been much more likely to have an interest in and an eye for art than the college president. This is lamentable, but it is true, and the result is a literary narrowness that has marked some of our greatest scholars, our deepest thinkers, and even our highest poets. They have understood the poetry of Greece but not its sculpture, the history of the Middle Ages but not their architecture, the thought of the Renaissance but not its painting; and in each case they have failed to understand what is precisely the most characteristic manifestation of the race and of the age. Some teaching of art, then, is admittedly necessary to a broad general culture. What shall it be?

Mr. Sturgis's answer is this: It "should be limited to history, theory, critical examination of ancient and modern works of art, and of the schools and large groups into which we divide them for the sake of convenience; and, . . . in connection with this theoretical study, such arts as are not manual arts may may be taught "more or less well" by a is that "university education has to do with all that can be taught in words, and all that is expressible in the language of words," while "a manual art has nothing to do with the thoughts which are expressible in words; by it thoughts are expressed wholly otherwise." He would allow that architecture may be taught "more or less well" by a university, because architecture is hardly so much an art to-day as a science: sculpture and painting are distinctly "manual arts" in his view—"they are the result of the skilled hand of man inspired directly by the mind which has, by nature and by training, a peculiar ability not noticeable in the ordinary pursuits of mankind." Such training cannot be given by words or by any conceivable course of lectures; it must be given "by what used to be called apprenticeship, by the actual touch of the matured artist, watched, imitated, analyzed insensibly, studied continually by the pupil." Moreover, this apprenticeship, whether, as preferably, in the master's own workshop or, as is most likely under modern conditions, in the "art-school," should begin early in life. Fifteen is, according to Mr. Sturgis, and he is right, none too early an age for its beginning. In modern times a few artists have achieved greatness in spite of late beginnings; but they have seldom been technical masters; and in the days when men really knew how to paint, they were put to the trade in their earliest youth.

This reasoning we take to be perfectly sound and conclusive, as far as it goes. The university can never make painters and sculptors as it makes doctors and lawyers, and attempts to make musicians and architects. Does it follow that it should not try to teach some drawing and modelling? In the first place it may be pointed out that in painting, for instance, there is an art, a science, and a handicraft. The art cannot be taught at all and never has been; the craft cannot be successfully taught by a university; the science, that of visual aspects, is as much a scientific study as any other; and if all science is the province of the university, this science also should be taught there. It cannot be taught by words alone, without actual practice in drawing and painting; therefore, some practical instruction in such work should be a part of the scientific equipment of a university. We do not attempt to teach chemistry without a laboratory, or anatomy without dissection, so that, in a sense, manual training is already a part of university education.

After all, why should university education have to do *only* with "all that can be taught in words and all that is expressible in the language of words"? Is it not the ideal of the university to produce the highest human efficiency as well as the broadest culture, and is not athletics to-day really a part of every university curriculum? The Greeks would have thought little of an education that trained the brain without training the senses. To-day we seem all agreed, on utilitarian grounds, that drawing should be taught in the public schools; why should that teaching cease when university training begins? Drawing is a language and a science, and every human being would be more efficient in any department of life if he had as much of that language and that science as he was capable of mastering.

Suppose, however, that we scorn utility, and that our idea of a university is, like Lowell's, that it should be a place where nothing useful is taught. We allow that the history and theory of art, that archæology and æsthetics, are proper subjects of instruction. But it is pre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cisely because these things have been taught by men with an exclusively literary education that they have been taught wrongly. No man without some practical training in art ever at all understood the art he theorized about; and those who have thought that education should deal only with what is expressible in words have spun words endlessly and darkened counsel. Goethe knew better, and, when he wished to saturate himself with the Greek spirit, he drew from the antique. It is not probable that he drew very well, but it *is* probable that he learned more than if he had spent the time reading Winckelmann. The few books on art that are worth reading have been written by practising artists; and more insight into what painting really is and what painters try to do is to be got from an hour of Fromentin or La Farge than from a year's study of æsthetics.

To conclude: The university will not succeed in training practical artists. Art is, however, one of the most important activities of humanity, and the works of art left us by the past are the most permanent record of the feelings and ideals of mankind. Some knowledge of and feeling for art, especially the arts of design, is requisite to any true and high culture, and the university should endeavor to give such knowledge and to cultivate such feeling. This has never been done, and can never be done to any purpose without some practical training in drawing and modelling, or both. Therefore the university, besides courses of lectures on art history and theory, illustrated by such collections of works of art or of reproductions of them as it can attain to, should give practical instruction, by the best masters, in the arts of design.

EDUCATION FOR WOMEN IN GERMANY.

The recent death in Leipzig of Fräulein Augusta Schmidt, for years one of the ablest leaders of the German movement for larger social and educational opportunities for women, has called forth respectful tributes to her ability and her high ideals from many German newspapers. Like Frau Louisa Otto-Peters, who died in 1895, Frl. Schmidt was a pioneer in this field of activity, entering it when the slightest connection with the woman's-rights movement entailed unlimited abuse and ridicule. Their opponents were quick to say that it was not more schools and industrial openings for women at which these agitators really aimed, but the upsetting of the entire social order and the unsexing of women. They were, therefore, ranked with anarchists, socialists, and Social-Democrats, even when Augusta Schmidt declined to let Social-Democratic women's clubs enter the national association of women's clubs, which she had founded after an American model. That Frl. Schmidt should have lived long enough to see old prejudices overthrown in many directions, and to have won respectful obituaries even from her severest critics, is proof positive of the marked change in the status of women which has taken place in Germany within the last thirty, or even twenty years.

Herself a teacher, it was her knowledge of the difficulties besetting young women who desired to become really qualified instructors that first led Augusta Schmidt into movements designed to benefit her countrywomen as a whole. With Frau Otto-Peters she founded, in 1865, the Leipzig society for the education of women. By 1890 she was able to take part in the establishment of a national women teachers' association, and in 1895 she became the first president of the League of German Women's Clubs, already referred to. In 1865 she was one of two or three German women to dare to speak in public. In 1902 she not only saw her cause warmly championed by the political party numerically strongest in the Empire, but even heard the Minister of the Interior declare in the Reichstag that much must be done to widen the present industrial opportunities for women. Any one familiar with the ordinary German attitude towards women, and the intense feeling existing, ten or fifteen years ago, against those engaged in industrial pursuits, must admit that Augusta Schmidt and her fellow-laborers expressed from the beginning a tendency and a movement of the times which can no more be stayed by German conservatism than by French prejudice or American indifference.

In her exhaustive study of the woman question recently published in Leipzig Frau Lily Braun has traced the growth of the movement of which Augusta Schmidt died the leader. The organization of her countrywomen in clubs she finds as significant as the similar movement in the United States has proved to be. Since the state would not help in educating women, some of these women's clubs undertook the task. The *Lette-verein* began this work in Berlin in 1866, with the aid of and under the direction of men. "We demand only that the arena of work be opened to women," was the motto of Augusta Schmidt's Leipzig society. It had among its members many, like Fanny Lewald-Stahr, who worked secretly to keep body and soul together "because it was not proper for women of her class to earn money." They were not daunted by many indignant rebuffs when they applied for Government help in establishing advanced schools for women teachers, or by the general condemnation of the learned classes. Their example was rapidly followed in other parts of the empire, but it was not until well along in the eighties than an Englishwoman was able to establish the first high school for women in Berlin, by the aid of the *Lette-verein* and private generosity, together with the encouragement of the late Empress Frederick.

By the end of the eighties the agitation for improved educational facilities was better organized, and became so insistent that from that time forward substantial victories were won. The universities soon began to receive German women, but only as "guests." In 1893, women were allowed to take the final examinations at the Government boys' schools called gymnasia. In many cities courses corresponding to those taught in the gymnasia were established by private associations or by the municipal authorities. In two of the smaller cities girls were admitted to the boys' schools. Munich and Breslau then attempted to establish gymnasia for women, but this was too much for the Minister of Public Instruction. He declared that he must "put out this spark before it became a devastating flame," and Governmental sanction for the undertaking was promptly withheld. It mattered not that Russia had already had such schools for thirty years, and that China was about to establish one; in this instance the forward movement met with a distinct check.

But it was only for a moment, since in 1899 women were admitted to the state examinations in medicine and pharmacy. Since then the German Cabinet has been working diligently to remove every obstacle in the path of women doctors, despite the fact that, when the first petition bearing on this matter was presented to the Reichstag in 1891, it was deemed a revolutionary document, full of pestilential American teaching about the rights of women, and not even a hearing was granted. State examinations for women seeking places as Oberlehrerinnen (advanced teachers) were established at the Victoria Lyceum and the Humboldt Academy in Berlin, and at the University of Göttingen. Most gratifying of all, however was the action of the Universities of Heidelberg and Freiburg in Baden in admitting women to all the rights and privileges pertaining to men. Even in Germany the world has moved—in this case with surprising suddenness, considering the conservativism of centuries to be overcome.

But the advocates of equal educational privileges for women are by no means content with these advances. Contrasting them with what has been accomplished elsewhere, Frau Braun finds the progress slow and hesitating, however it may seem to an outsider, and she states that in the industrial world there are few victories to rejoice over. There is, none the less, a great change in public sentiment to record. No one would have dreamed, twenty years ago, that an imperial minister would dare to ask great industrial openings for women, who outnumber the men in Germany by no less

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than a million souls. Nor would any German professor have ventured in the eighties to declare publicly, as Professor Harnack did last May, that the woman's educational movement is in every sense praiseworthy, and that the woman without a profession or occupation is a dead weight in the community. He confidently expects an improvement in the morals of men and women, and better relations between the sexes, as a result of the changes now taking place. It must not be forgotten that the presence of hundreds, if not thousands, of cultured and attractive American women has helped to instil into German minds a higher ideal for womankind than that typified by the Hausfrau—too often a mere upper servant, whose ignorance renders mental companionship with husbands or sons an impossibility.

A FRENCHMAN'S DIARY IN OUR CIVIL-WAR TIME.—IV.

January 14, 1865.—With Commodore Drayton, visited the Navy-yard. In the evening, dined with Senator Sprague: Chase, Sumner, Agassiz, Dana, M. de Gerolt.

Off for City Point, armed with a pass from Mr. Lincoln written wholly in his own hand. Arrived at the wharf of embarkation, in military occupation, I show my pass and go aboard the steamboat with numerous officers and some civilians—paymasters, army contractors. No civilian is allowed to take his baggage to his state-room—a precaution adopted against incendiaries, who might introduce combustibles. All the baggage is collected in a room guarded by a special officer. The boat puts out amid river ice. We have a view of the huge buildings of the Arsenal, the hay magazine, the hills crowned with forts. At every moment boats cross our course. Everything with an engine has been requisitioned, even to old ferry-boats.

We stop at Alexandria to take on convalescent soldiers returning to the army; on the wharf, quite a population of black stevedores. Proceeding, we perceive the white walls of Mt. Vernon, behind the trees of the promontory. State-rooms were allotted after leaving Alexandria. A young colonel of the 130th New York obligingly procures one for me. He belongs in Trobriand's brigade and praises his chief highly. The morale of the army is excellent. Since Grant interdicted whiskey, there has been no more drunkenness, and few punishments are necessary. I scrape acquaintance with a big, square-headed German with gray moustaches, a revolutionary Forty-eighter from Hesse-Darmstadt. He is an officer of engineers, and kindly sketches for me the lines before Richmond—three front lines protected by forts, a rear line likewise protected. The army is camped in this gigantic gut. In the evening the pilot perceives a great fire which is for a moment taken to be a burning steamer, but turns out to be a house.

In the morning I woke not far from Fortress Monroe, the most important on the coast. On the tiny island, the Rip-Raps, facing it, a large stone fort is in process of construction to command the entrance to Chesapeake Bay. We enter the vast Hampton Roads. At Newport News is visible on the beach the skeleton of the *Congress*, sunk by the *Merrimac* in its contest with the *Monitor;* further on, some remains of the *Cumberland*, which went down in the same fight. We pass near the *Florida*, a Confederate pirate, whose two canting masts are almost wholly out of water. The air is very mild. The broad and lazy river James flows between wooded banks. We cross the bar, meeting some transport constantly. Curious types of officers—a few foreign veterans; youngsters silent and thoughtful; old heads, bronzed, fagged, gaunt, with shaggy beards and hair; no apparent hierarchy. For a detail of costume: each officer wears the characteristic badge of his corps d'armée.—Fort Powhatan, dominating the plain reached by Grant's army after his bloody campaign across Virginia. From there the army threw itself upon Petersburg.—Deserted plantations of the Wilcoxes, the Seldons (whose house was built two centuries ago of English brick), the Harrisons. At Harrison's Landing one may still see traces of the camps in which the Army of the Potomac was shut up for two months.—At last, City Point, announced by a forest of masts. We draw near amid a fleet of schooners, transports, and tugboats. Improvised wooden structures line the levee. A railroad built on the muddy slope of the stream appears.

I exhibit my pass and am directed to headquarters, which overlooks the harbor and is indicated by a large stars-and-stripes. I am taken to the Office, a log cabin consisting of but a single room. Lt. Col. Bowers reads Charles Sumner's letter to Grant brought by me, and examines my pass in Lincoln's handwriting. He tells me the General is ill, but he himself is entirely at my disposal. As there is no empty tent to-day for night occupation, I must sleep at the hotel, a big wooden affair run up in several days.

Walked about the camp and came upon a black regiment. Dined with the officers of the General Staff; a short and silent meal. At the Office in the evening.

The next day I set off by rail, Col. Bowers giving me a young officer named Porter to accompany me to Meade's headquarters. We traverse great woods, at this moment given over to remorseless choppers. Meade Station—Hancock Station—Parke Station; before us is Meade's flag, at the top of a small knoll. I seek Gen. Hunt, chief of artillery, who breakfasts me and takes me to the lines. Visit Fort Wadsworth, Fort Wilcox, situated on the extreme left, whence we perceive the line of Federal pickets marked by smoke; beyond, the line of Confederate pickets; and still beyond, a Confederate fort. Visited the Federal pickets. At present there is a tacit truce. We see distinctly the Confederate sentinels pacing deliberately, gun under arm. We examine them at our leisure with a field-glass; we might talk with them if we raised our voices slightly. During such truces the pickets of the two camps communicate with one another, in spite of their officers' orders. They exchange coffee for tobacco, New York papers for Richmond. I chat a moment with a group of German pickets, who tell me, laughing, that a moment before our arrival some Confederates had gone for wood to a thicket where the Federals were cutting, and had retired without being molested. The Johnnies and the Yankees are almost friends at this extreme limit where the armies are closest together. The General is disturbed only by the new Confederate fort, which is going up in a good position, and intends to mount guns of heavier calibre in Fort Walsh.

I bid adieu in German to the soldiers with whom I have been talking, and we return to headquarters. Smoke hangs over the camp and fills the aisles of the pine forest. Distant drums, military brass, galloping steeds, braying mules, lowing cattle in their pens, fill the air with strange sounds. Night falls. The tent-lights, the sparkling smoke, spot here and there the illimitable pitchy background. We dine in the tent. After a modest repast, Gen. Hunt conducts me to Gen. Meade's wooden house. I see a tall, lean-faced man, with gray beard, retreating and bald forehead, large nose suggesting a bird of prey, a face without much character. The General himself accompanies me back to the station through the quagmire. In default of passenger-coaches, I return to headquarters in a baggage-car in company with a German officer of the topographic service.

I spend some time at headquarters. The General Staff is very small, and its work enormous, yet done methodically and without fuss. An Indian colonel, with the copper color of the Redskins, is one of the workers. On the eve of my departure, Grant, hitherto silent, asks me to walk with him after dinner. He talks of Sumner, who had given me a letter to him, and expresses his sympathy for him, his policy, and his character. He speaks of Lincoln with equal respect and sympathy. He hopes the war will end with the capture of Richmond. Slavery will not survive the war. His language is simple, frank, decided, stripped of all ornament and artifice. I was infinitely touched by this confidence.

In Washington once more. Dined at Senator Morgan's with Mr. Seward, his daughter-in-law, Secretary Welles and his wife, Postmaster-General Denison, Charles Sumner, Admiral and Mrs. Farragut. A very sumptuous dinner; Seward very lively, very chatty, as usual. It would be difficult to say against which he is most incensed for their attitude towards the United States, England or Napoleon III.

January 25.—From Washington to New York. Called on General Scott; fine and imposing face, and a very grand air. He has just published memoirs. In the evening saw Booth as Hamlet, the best acting of the part I have ever seen: a Dantesque, poetic face, no little grace of movement. He represents a simulated madness, and very happily accentuates the incoherences, oddities, the distraught and unconscious side of the rôle.

Went with Bancroft to Bierstadt's studio (he is the landscape painter of the Rocky Mountains and the Yosemite Valley), and to that of Church, more poetic, very much of a colorist, an imitator of Turner. American landscape painters seek the grand rather than the humble, the fantastic rather than the simple.

January 30.—Weymouth. Extracts from a letter of this date to the Duc d'Aumale.

"Monseigneur,—I send you a little drawing which will explain to you better than many words the result of my visit to the Army of the James. . . .

"Neither shall I undertake to describe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

camp life to one who knows it better than anybody. The little I saw of it left only agreeable impressions. I am grieved to say that I found in all grades of the Army (I except Grant and Meade, who are not very communicative) great irritation against England. Perhaps as great exists against France, but out of politeness was concealed from me. I recall among others a young officer from Vermont, who returned with me from City Point to Washington, saying, 'I have served my time out: I have been three years in the army, and been in fifty-eight engagements or battles. I believe I have done my duty, but I do not like war. What I have done, I have done because my country needs soldiers. I am glad to return to my family and business, and I hope never again to draw the sword. But, sir, if war were declared against England, were it ten years hence, or twenty, I would not wait a day to enter a regiment, as a private if need be.'

"Such is the feeling. I do not discuss it, I simply relate. It is this that renders very difficult the work of Sumner and Seward, who are truly friends of peace. Nevertheless, I have not much faith in the breaking out of war between America and England. The latter country can retrace her steps in time; but every day I grow more apprehensive lest the Mexican affair should drag ourselves into war with the United States. I believe that the American question and the Mexican question are destined to become one of the principal battle-grounds of the French Opposition. It would truly be too unfortunate if some day, through the Emperor's fault, it should be our lot to bear the cost of a war with the United States, after having lost the opportunity of conquering, without drawing the sword and by a few simple words of sympathy, a precious alliance. The grand policy which governs us and whose profound combinations are so much admired, is quite capable eventually of converting traditional sympathy, already chilled by its fault, into sentiments of genuine hostility. Who is to profit by this policy inspired by the simple necessity of doing something different from what old France did? Russia, who alone had the sense to declare her friendship for the United States without making the least sacrifice; and England, who will be charmed to see America's flood of wrath and bitterness diverted from herself, and to whom, in case of war between the United States and France, will fall the world's commerce and the decision of all the great questions relating to the law of nations.

"Unfortunately there is nobody in France to say all this. No one there has yet comprehended the immense scope of the war and of the revolution in the United States. We Parisians prefer the geography of Schleswig-Holstein to that of a vast continent in which Schleswig-Holstein would be but a fly-speck. A great minister like Richelieu or Cavour would have done everything to assure the friendship of the United States. Old World affairs have found lodgment in those of the New World, and will never be absolutely detached from them. America has felt her strength, and will want to make use of it like the bird that feels its wings. We ought to have held ourselves in readiness to profit by this new force, material as well as moral."

February 4.—Boston. Meeting at Music Hall, in which Garrison proclaims his confidence in Lincoln. He will not, like Wendell Phillips, make the question of negro suffrage a weapon against the Government. The right of suffrage is not a natural right. The black man once liberated, the task of the abolitionists is at an end; the social place of the freedmen in the United States will be determined by manifold considerations over which the abolitionists have no control. Gen. Butler, who succeeded Garrison, pleaded at length in favor of the political equality of the two races. His delivery was pompous and vulgar. Butler was relieved from command of the Army of the James. He is almost traitorous in his attacks on Grant and Sherman.

Weymouth.—The Universalist Church of this town has for pastor a woman, the Rev. Olympia Brown, who studied theology at Oberlin College (Ohio). The church edifice is small and of wood, and looks like a lecture-room. Miss Brown occupies a platform at the far end of the hall. Her dress is black and she has no ornament in her hair. Pale and thin, her face has distinction. After the singing of a hymn, she offered prayer, followed by another hymn. She then read her discourse, her one theme being the amendment of the Constitution. This great change has been due not to the war, for war has no liberal action, but to God, to the action of immutable laws. All this was very well phrased, in a firm voice and refined manner. The audience were serious; some of the women wept when the speaker referred to the victims of the war. What especially pleased me in the sermon was that it had a genuine religious accent, and did not appear to have been patterned upon newspaper articles.

After the closing hymn, Miss Brown announced to her congregation a temperance meeting to be held shortly. Then, to my great surprise, she remarked that, one of the members of the congregation having asked for some particulars about a French philosopher, Diderot, of whom she had recently spoken, she would put at his disposal a book from her library. Finally, she gave notice that, at the afternoon service, she would, by the request of several persons, preach on the belief in hell.

February 14.—James Russell Lowell came to spend the day with us at Weymouth. He is witty, and not stingy of his wit. He spoke much of England; he loves her, for is she not "the old country"? Politically, he is a decided partisan of the present Administration. He considers Lincoln to be a superior man, whose glory will equal Washington's. He began to appreciate him after the speech at Gettysburg. Lowell is greatly attached to the memory of Clough, a dreamy spirit, disquieted and poetic, who passed a year at Cambridge, Mass.

I met Lowell again at the *Atlantic* Club, where we dined with Longfellow, Holmes, Agassiz, Governor Andrew, E. P. Whipple. It was very diverting. Holmes related his impressions as a lecturer:

"When I go from place to place, I seem to be constantly meeting the same public everywhere. It is a sort of multivertebrate animal, a serpent that comes every evening to uncoil itself at my feet, looks at me and listens, ready to devour me. The hardest moments for lecturers are those spent in waiting for belated trains. Often, in some out-of-the-way station, in bitter cold, we wait and listen; the slightest noises become perceptible—not only the far-off snapping of a branch under the weight of snow, but the subjective sounds of the human organs. Sight undergoes exaltation as well as hearing; the stars seem to grow bigger. At last the locomotive draws near, the train arrives; we jump on the car platform—the vividest image of salvation."

George William Curtis, one of the most popular lecturers, once went to a village in the State of New York. In view of party differences they begged him not to talk on politics. He had nothing in readiness except a lecture on Thackeray. Nobody in the audience had read one of his novels. Curtis's allusions and criticism fell upon the void. At the close of the lecture, the chief personages came to greet him. "Mr. Curtis," said the schoolmaster, "you must bring about an agreement among us on one point. For a week here we have been disputing over Longfellow, whether he is dead or isn't dead." "I dined with him," answered Curtis, "a fortnight ago." "Ah," said the schoolmaster, visibly disappointed; then, presently: "Anyhow, I'm sure somebody is dead."

Farewell supper at Norton's in Cambridge, with Longfellow, Lowell, and Child.

Attended a philosophical soirée at the house of William R. Alger, a Unitarian clergyman. Mrs. Howe read an essay entitled, "Limitations," second in a series she is about to publish. The next day I dined with her and her oldest daughter, a charming young person.

AUGUSTE LAUGEL.

THE STATUS OF HISTORY IN SOUTHERN EDUCATION.

RANDOLPH-MACON COLLEGE, VA.,
July, 1902.

One would naturally expect a keen appreciation of historical studies on the part of Southerners. Nowhere in the Union is there such tenacious reverence for the past and its traditions, nowhere else does each individual so readily make the history of his State or section a personal matter. Yet there is no section of the country in which both local and national history is so little studied and so imperfectly understood. To be sure, there are Southern writers and strictly Southern text-books, but the writers are in the main special pleaders, and the text-books are dependent on books written at the North, not on investigation of the sources at hand. I propose to inquire briefly into the causes of this backwardness.

The ruling classes of society are usually responsible for the kind of training the young receive, and this applies particularly to collegiate training. Education is directed from above, since the teachers in general take into the lower schools the ideas prevalent at the higher. For this reason the status of history in colleges will receive my principal attention. The Southern college is modelled after the University of Virginia; and Thomas Jefferson was the oracle of that institution. His idea of education was favorable to versatility rather than mastery; so the curriculum of his great high-school was arranged according to the humanist ideals of the sixteenth century, *i. e.*, with Latin, Greek, mathe-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matics, and philosophy as the four foundation-pillars of learning. The sciences, both natural and social, were made adjunct to these, or at least secondary. The subjects of study for a Roman youth of the early Imperial period were made the principal subjects of study in Virginia eighteen hundred years later. All that the world had learned during the long interval of time, all it had experienced, was of but secondary importance. As this university grew, the idea of a universal knowledge for the young student gained constantly in the minds of Jefferson's successors. The Master's degree soon came to mean the completion of all the studies offered there, and not special excellence in a single group.

As Jefferson anticipated, the youth of the land, more particularly Southerners, "flocked to the Virginia fountain." They returned home feeling that education meant the ability to scan a line of Latin and render into fair English a Greek play. And the class of men who went to the Virginia University were those who built up other schools, who controlled the politics of the South. But, parallel to this influence in education, another had grown up and was quite powerful during the fourth and fifth decades of the last century, when the two coalesced, so far as educational policy was concerned. It was the party of Christian education, reinforced by the success of similar teaching at the North, especially in New England. The Presbyterians, the Baptists, and Methodists all agreed before 1830 on the policy of an educated clergy. And so (in Virginia) Randolph-Macon, Richmond, Emory and Henry, (in North Carolina) Wake Forest and Davidson Colleges, were established during the years 1830-40. A little later (in South Carolina and Georgia) Furman and Mercer Universities were opened. All these schools adopted outright the policy of the University of Virginia, with the exception that philosophy was modified so as to serve the ends of Christian education. As history had only a secondary place at the University of Virginia, it likewise received little attention at the younger institutions. In a few instances there were older institutions which had acquired considerable influence before Jefferson's university was established. The College of Charleston, South Carolina; Hampden-Sydney and William and Mary, in Virginia; the University of North Carolina, and Franklin College, in Georgia, were the most important. None of these had ever given any systematic courses of instruction in history, and there was little change necessary when, about 1830, they readjusted their curricula, owing to the success of the great institution at Charlottesville, Va.

It was not until after the civil war that any break in the ranks of the college quadrivium was made; and this was done by Prof. Thomas R. Price, now of Columbia University, New York. He succeeded in getting the first chair of English in the South established in Randolph-Macon College, and from this high-grade denominational school the University of Virginia secured its first professor of English. Gradually the other Southern schools followed suit. This gave the college five culture (or disciplinary) courses, and these compose to-day almost the entire work of the Southern college student. The conservative forces of nearly all our educational institutions deny positively that any other subject has anything like the culture value of one of these. It will be asked, Did not history form any part of the training given by the colleges? It did. The University of Virginia required its language professors to teach the history of the people whose language was being studied. Hence arose the custom of associating the history of Greece with the Greek language, the history of Rome with Latin, and so on with France and Germany. And, as has been seen, what "Virginia" did, the other colleges imitated.

About 1880, Johns-Hopkins University established the department of historical and political science, with Herbert B. Adams at its head. In a few years graduates of this institution began to clamor for the creation of chairs of history; and in 1892 Trinity College, North Carolina, then under the control of an able Northern man, President Crowell, yielded to the demand, and the first independent department of history in the South was established. This new department immediately showed signs of great vitality, and history soon commanded a place beside Latin as an educative subject. From the beginning Trinity College has led in the scientific study of history in North Carolina, and in some respects in the whole South. The department has never been wanting in students.

Such an object-lesson could not long remain without influence, especially since the Johns Hopkins continued to send out many well-equipped students ready, like missionaries, to undertake and push forward the study of their chosen subject. The State universities, the denominational and technical colleges—the most important of them—have established chairs of history, though in most instances combining with history some other subject, such as economics or sociology. But even now, in nearly all first-rate colleges, history is not accorded full rank as a culture subject. It is given to a teacher who as often as otherwise makes some other subject his specialty, which, of course, practically destroys the so-called less important course. Again, the college president who has some spare time from administrative duties is often given the department of history. To illustrate the insignificance of the subject as viewed by some college trustees, one of the largest denominational schools in the South has just given its professor of Latin the new department of history, and, in order the better to advertise their indifference, the Trustees elected a specialist in history to the chair of English! But this is not general. A spirit of advance is to be found in the most progressive institutions.

Yet the status of these departments, relative to others—such, for example, as Latin or Greek—is not satisfactory. For the A. B. degree the humanities have the right of way. History, as shown by the catalogues of a large number of Southern colleges, is required for this course (1) in the universities, three hours a week for one collegiate year—a course which gives only the outlines of general history, beginning with the early Greeks and closing with the year 1789; (2) in the high-grade denominational colleges, three to five hours a week, the same sort of instruction. In the technical schools, neither in Virginia nor in North Carolina, is any knowledge of history, either European or American, required. Georgia and the States further south generally require from three to five hours a week in American and English history for the B. S. degree. In the largest universities, in the courses looking to the Master's degree, three additional hours are required if history is one of the *elected* subjects; and the same holds for the denominational colleges. In the technical schools there is seldom any demand for other than the primary work done in the same schools for the B. S. As for highly specialized study in particular fields of history, the University of Texas alone makes any creditable showing.

As to the number of men teaching history, only two universities employ more than one man; and some institutions having from six to eleven hundred students enrolled, and enjoying incomes of from seventy-five to one hundred thousand dollars a year, have no need for more than one man! The number of students who take history even in preparing for the law is amazingly small, which indicates the nature of the work done; and as for becoming specialists, one seldom finds a young man so visionary.

Why the study has found such tardy recognition, and why it is even now opposed most persistently, is a question which naturally arises. I shall attempt to give two or three answers in explanation:

(1.) It was the influence of the humanist teachers in the early part of the last century, when Southern life was being fixed in certain grooves. Southerners are the most conservative people in the United States; and when a certain kind of training has come, whether reasonably or not, to be recognized as part of a gentleman's education, any change at all is the same as an attack on the existing order of things. It is this sheer conservatism in favor of the classics in the first instance that causes Southerners to neglect the study of history, even of their own section.

(2.) Another cause is the complete change of all economic conditions in the South since 1865, which has revolutionized society in general, and which has turned backward the tide of intellectual advance. In 1850 the percentage of illiterate whites in the South was not so great as it is to-day! So there is no great demand for development in intellectual matters. Few teachers of history are required in the secondary and high schools. A large number of those who attend colleges everywhere expect to devote their lives to teaching. They study what must be taught again—that is, the more conservative subjects. And, again, as a result of the upheaval of 1865, the wealth of the country has changed hands, and it is too soon for the owners of this wealth to be so cultured as to care for a liberal education for their sons—and history must always be more or less of a culture study, a study for people who have leisure.

(3.) The last explanation is the condition of public opinion. Notwithstanding the radical changes which have taken place, public sentiment has been and is still controlled by men who were either participants in the great Civil War or whose fathers were. This public opinion positively demands that teachers of history, both in the colleges and in the high schools, shall subscribe unreservedly to two trite oaths: (1) that the South was altogether right in seceding from the Union in 1861; and (2) that the war was not waged about the negro. No investigation,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no honest unbiassed work can ever be hoped for when such a confession of faith is made a *sine qua non* of fitness for teaching or writing history. To illustrate this, I have but to cite the case of a fine old gentleman of ante-bellum antecedents, a member of a good family, whose knowledge of history consists in having memorized the standard texts of some twenty years ago. This gentleman is professor of history in one of the largest State universities in the South. On a vacation ramble about a year ago the writer happened into his lecture-room, and learned from a well-worn copy of Oman's 'History of England,' and from some students who still lingered about the classic walls, that this single text constituted the whole work of the senior history class in that college! On the margins of the pages were recorded in very small characters the stock stories and jokes doled out to patient students from year to year. The text was repeatedly marked, "Tell joke No. 1, or No. 2, at this point."

What is it that keeps scores of such good old gentlemen at the heads of the most important departments of study in Southern schools? Clearly, a public sentiment which taboos the most vital subject in American history, a sentiment which demands from every one a full justification of the South in all its past history. Behind these men is the individual influence of the Confederate veterans, who, having once had a share in making history, now demand that their views of its teaching and writing shall be everywhere accepted. They meet together in great assemblies, and, without critical knowledge or even careful examination of the books used in schools and colleges, make out a list of authors whose works may be used. It is not difficult to say what class of writers are commended.

Next to the Confederate soldier's influence in retarding the advance of true historical studies is that of the Southern publisher, who makes capital of the so-called patriotic sentiment. He feels the pulse of the Confederate veteran and takes the measure of the reviewer, who is usually of the accepted type, and then publishes his *Southern* text-books. The representative of the largest publishing-house in the South recently refused so much as to read the manuscript of a piece of investigation in Southern history, though posing all the while as the champion of Southern history-writing, its very Mæcenas.

It will be seen that, under such conditions, no healthy criticism can exist. The results of investigation are fixed for an author before his work begins. The sentence of the reviewer is likewise dictated by an uncompromising public dogmatism. These, then, are some of the conditions which check the development of scholarship, which prevent the higher institutions of learning from taking their rightful stand, and which seriously retard the educational and intellectual advance of the South. They are natural conditions, to be sure—conditions which, until recent years, prevailed at the North, but which, as is indicated by the discussion of the recent proposition of Charles Francis Adams to erect a monument in Washington to R. E. Lee, are fast disappearing, and it is to be hoped they are also passing away in our section.

In truth, healthy beginnings are being made at many points. In every Southern State there are honest and able young students who are beginning to address themselves to the task of writing in true characters the history of their sections—students who are becoming authors of books which require no recommendation, and which find publishers in any part of the country. In South Carolina a great scholar is giving to the public a history of that State in the Revolution which compares favorably with any similar work ever produced by an American writer; in Alabama there has arisen a small coterie of competent critics who, by the aid which the State is freely giving, promise much for that part of the country; in Texas, at its great University, in North Carolina and Tennessee, magazines of history and biography are doing pioneer, almost missionary, work in their fields. So it is not altogether an unpromising future which we face. And there are at present two movements of quite recent origin which brighten still more the promise of the future. These are the educational revolution of which the Ogden Association is a part, and the campaign, best illustrated in North Carolina, for the establishment of rural and town libraries. In North Carolina alone about five hundred small libraries were established last year. An educated public may be influenced and a reading public may be convinced. May not these beginnings be the harbingers of intellectual emancipation, of independent literary production?

WM. E. DODD.

Correspondence.

THE ATLANTIC FISHERY AND PROTECTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is one of the most remarkable anomalies of the twentieth century that the two leading republics of the world, France and the United States, the two countries that boast the loudest of their freedom, should be each distinguished for their adhesion to an absurd antiquated system of protection, which utterly disregards the true interests of the people, and is dictated solely by a ring of monopolists for their own selfish ends. Take, for instance, the question of a drawback on Cuban sugar. Every motive of national honor and sound policy demanded liberal treatment for the southern island by her great republican neighbor and protector, yet, as we have seen, notwithstanding President Roosevelt's stirring words, American good faith, the reputation and character of a great country, was to be trampled in the dust and brought into contempt before the whole world simply to protect the beet-sugar monopolists.

When we come to look into the workings of protection in both France and the United States, the plain man finds absurdities and monstrosities worthy of the grotesque politics of Laputa. France easily leads the van. Here in North America the national Government, in order to keep up a fishery in Newfoundland, gives (1) a bounty exceeding the intrinsic value of the fish; (2) a drawback quite equal to the bounty; (3) 50 francs a head for every one engaged in the transatlantic fishery, plus 50 francs more per fisherman given by the Municipal Council of St. Pierre for every Frenchman engaged on the Newfoundland coast; (4) a bounty of 4,000 francs distributed among her shore fishermen. Outside the cost of three expensive war-ships, France pays $240 per man for every one of her subjects engaged in this trade.

The follies and utter absurdities of protection could hardly go further. But when we come to examine the American policy of excluding foreign fish, and preventing the public from obtaining this most necessary and valuable food at reasonable rates, we can perceive that their system is just as illogical, as absurd, and as mischievous to the nation as the ridiculous methods of France. A high tax on a necessary article of food which amounts to an actual prohibition of its free consumption by the public, is a burden which no free people should suffer. The English people would not bear it for a moment. The Americans are a patient people; they suffer the monopolists gladly who plunder them on fuel and light. Only the odious Meat Trust seems to have stirred them up. This outrageous attempt to raise the price of food touched their stomachs, a tender point with the great republic. Has it ever occurred to the citizens of this great nation that, for a century, they have been burdened with a tyrannical monopoly in their food supply as grievous as the attempted Meat Trust? There is not a shred of an argument of any kind in favor of the fish monopoly. It used to be claimed that it manned the national navy. The official naval experts have completely exploded this idea. The men protected are not even Americans; by far the greater portion of the deep-sea fishermen are provincials and foreigners. To aid this motley alien crew and the fish rings, all Americans have to eat dear fish.

The toiling millions of Europe could not exist without eating cheap fish food. Take such a common product of the sea as the herring; all over England and the Continent its cost is two cents, or three for five cents. In the States a single herring costs five cents, or three times the price at which the English workman enjoys his bloater. What makes all this so monstrous and absurd is the ridiculously small number of people, a few hundred, who benefit by this protection to their petty trade, in comparison with the seventy millions who have to pay for the monopoly. The American deep-sea fishery to-day is a poor decaying industry. It is not even American, and a considerable portion of its product is not even caught by Americans. It does not furnish one-fourth of the supply of sea fish which should be consumed in the same proportion as in Europe..

The policy of the American Government in dealing with this vital question of the Atlantic fishery, for a great nation, has been contemptible in the extreme. They ask in the meanest way every favor from their smaller British neighbors, but they will give nothing in return. It is thoroughly well known that, without free access to the Newfoundland bait, the Bank fishery could not be carried on by the American fishermen. It is also officially reported to the revenue officers that the so-called "American industry," the winter frozen-herring business, is a gigantic fraud. Brought in free as "American products," there is not one thing American about the whole business except the Yankee gold that pays for the fish. All are caught and frozen by the English residents. What I have pointed out in former papers on this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subject is not only the cruel absurdity of a tax on food in the twentieth century; in this special case the monopoly acts as an actual barrier to the public supply of most valuable sustenance. If these barriers were thrown down, British North America could furnish the States with an abundance and variety of cheap fish, as full and ample as England now enjoys.

Sir John A. McDonald always maintained that there was nothing to expect from the liberality or enlightenment of the American Government. Their dealings with British America were always a compound of arrogance and selfish meanness, as short-sighted as contemptible. It is now certain that this peddling policy in regard to the fisheries will be checkmated in a thoroughly effective way. The union of Canada with Newfoundland is a foregone conclusion. The island colony is even now making the American fishermen pay a fixed price for his bait, besides a big fee for his license. When the Dominion obtains control of all the British fisheries, the Americans will be simply at their mercy. The Newfoundland bait supply, on which they depend, will either be prohibited altogether, or else made too dear to be purchased. Gloucester has already sounded the note of alarm, and sees a reciprocity treaty looming in the distance. What will the American Government do in these circumstances? Will it wait until free trade is forced upon them, or gracefully accept the inevitable?

D. W. Prowse.

St. Johns, Newfoundland, July 28, 1902.

CONGRESSIONAL ENCOUNTERS, NEW AND OLD.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In looking through some old numbers of Charles Dickens's magazine, *Household Words*, I chanced upon a paragraph or two that might well be republished—without comment—to-day. In No. 330, under the title, "The Congressional Prize Ring," comment is made upon the then recent assault of Preston S. Brooks of South Carolina upon Charles Sumner of Massachusetts in the Senate on the 22d of May, 1856. As certain events and casualties of the session of 1902 are fresh in interest, it may be edifying to print the following quotation:

"The forcible mode in which debates are conducted in the parliament of the United States, and the personal encounters which sometimes follow them, are believed by the present generation to be novelties and only recently brought to a culminating point by the Hon. Preston S. Brooks's life-preserver upon the head, face, eyes, and body of Senator Charles Sumner. This is a mistake. Fifty years ago, exciting debates often ended in a regular stand-up fight in the lobby of the House of Representatives. The combatants stripped, a ring was formed, bottle-holders appointed, and the latter fought and reported quite in the style of Moulsey Hurst and Bell's *Life in London*.

"In corroboration of this statement, we present to our readers the following paragraph copied from the New York *Evening Post* of December the thirteenth, eighteen hundred and five, into the Annual Register for eighteen hundred and six:

" 'On Friday last, the well-known Leib, one of the Representatives of Pennsylvania and leader of the Duane party, and Joseph H. Nicholson, one of the Representatives of Maryland, met in the Congress lobby about one o'clock, when Leib immediately called Nicholson a liar; and thereupon commenced one of the best-fought battles recorded in the annals of Congressional pugilism. The fight continued till the sixty-fourth round, when Leib had received such blows as deterred him from again facing his man. He protracted the fight, falling after making a feeble hit. In the round which ended the fight, those who backed him advised him to resign; which he did after a combat of one hour and seventeen minutes. The combatants were both very much beaten.' "

Albert C. Phelps.

New Orleans, July 22, 1902.

NICE DISTINCTIONS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The War Department acknowledges receipt of a report relative to the action taken by Gen. Chaffee in the case of Lieut. Lytle Brown of the Engineer Corps, U. S. A., who was recently tried for assault and battery on Charles O. Ziegenfuss, a citizen of Manila. It appears from the testimony that Lieut. Brown took offence at an article in the paper conducted by Ziegenfuss, and, in consequence thereof, proceeded to the latter's house one night, and "did then and there unlawfully, wilfully, and maliciously assault said Ziegenfuss by striking him with his, the said Brown's, clinched fist, and the said Brown did then and there otherwise beat, bruise, wound, and illtreat the said Ziegenfuss, knocking out two teeth of him the said Ziegenfuss. Said Brown did kick and jump upon the said Ziegenfuss with the feet of him, the said Brown, and did cause him, the said Ziegenfuss, to suffer great bodily pain and anguish." So the charges and specifications read.

That which seems incomprehensible, to the ordinary mind, at this distance, is the principle upon which army officers base their code of honor. Lieut. Brown was found guilty of the charge of assault and battery and sentenced to be "reprimanded." Of the second charge, of "conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman," in connection with the same offence, he was found not guilty. It is presumed from the finding of the court that nothing less than the killing of the said citizen would be regarded by it as unbecoming an officer, and such killing, in truth, would not—in the section of the country south of here from which Lieut. Brown undoubtedly hails—be regarded as unbecoming a gentleman.

On the other hand, suppose it had been a private soldier who, smarting under adverse criticism, had at night entered the house of a citizen and comported himself in the same manner as that of his superior officer, would the court-martial have been satisfied with imposing the farce of a "reprimand"? We are of the opinion that, under the circumstances narrated, the law-breaker would have been turned over to the civil authorities and would have had to expiate his offence by a goodly number of months in jail, suffer the loss of pay and emoluments, and thereafter dishonorably be discharged the service.

Privileges and distinctions of this nature can hardly be regarded as conducive to good order and military discipline. Veteran.

THE WASHINGTON-JEFFERSON LETTERS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It has been known that, after Washington's death, Tobias Lear permitted Alexander Hamilton to withdraw from his papers certain letters and documents. It was also rumored that Jefferson enjoyed the same privilege and used it to destroy all evidence of an interchange of caustic letters between Washington and himself. At intervals this rumor reappears, with variations and embroideries, and has almost attained the dignity of an historical fact. It is always difficult to treat such elusive matter, for the evidence supporting it is, as a rule, mere hearsay evidence, and yet is attributed to such sources as give it every semblance of truth. It was with pleasure that I found what is perhaps the earliest evidence in writing upon this Jefferson-Washington correspondence. Whatever Custis may have been, he was not a reliable witness on any question concerning his guardian. Weak of will, and possessed of an inordinate vanity, without real ability in any one line, and depending for his position and reputation on his connection with Washington, he babbled and romanced to any one who would listen to him. The solemn assertions in this letter, written to a kinsman, are ludicrous when examined according to the simplest rules of evidence. His promise of a more definite account in his volume on Washington was not kept, for that work is even less full and satisfactory on this point than the letter. In 1854, the chapter as it appears in the memoirs was printed in the *National Intelligencer*. The editor published a short note from Custis, in which he said:

"The story of the Lost Letters of the Rawlins Book I have put off to the last. It is a painful subject to me, but it was a bounden duty upon me, as Washington's Biographer and the last of his domestic family, to place this matter in the only light in which it can ever appear to the world."

The famous letter of Jefferson to Mazzei was first published in Italy, at Florence; a translation into French appeared in the *Moniteur*, and from that paper it was translated into English for the *Minerva*, the Federalist paper at New York, in which it was printed May 14, 1797. So far as is known, no letter passed between Washington and Jefferson after that date. There was too much to be explained on Jefferson's side, and too great sensitiveness and dignity on the part of Washington to make even an inquiry or explanation likely. I was unable to find any evidence in Washington's letter-books of mutilation, and am quite familiar with the books in Rawlins's writing. Now that we have what is intended to be the solemn testimony of one who always claimed to be in possession of the facts of the matter, it is safe to reject the whole story. The narrative of Custis is almost childish in its simplicity, but that is the least of its many weaknesses. He believed his own story, but his own evidence is against him.

Worthington C. Ford.

Boston, July 24, 1902.

Arlington House, Oct^{r} 8th 1832.

My D^{r} Sir

Your very interesting Letter of the 25th ult^{o} came duly to hand. Cholera among my people, and myself much indisposed, must plead my excuse for the too long delayed answer.

I have a most vivid recollection of all that happened at Mount Vernon, touching certain Letters supposed to have passed between General Washington, & Mr. Jefferson, subsequent to the famed *Letter to Mazzei*. All the details

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you have given of the conversations in the sitting Room, &c., are correct. As relates to myself, over & above my share in the general conversation, I have to observe that Colo. Lear called me into the Hall, and pressing my hand affectionately, remarked with emphasis—The gentlemen are mistaken, I tell you my Dear Washington. THERE WERE LETTERS. He then retired, without entering into explanations respecting the character or tendency of the letters he had thus solemnly declared to have passed between the parties.

Some time afterwards Colo. Lear visited me at Arlington House, previous to his journey to Boston, for embarkation to Algiers. I renewed the subject of the Letters, and pressed the Colo. to enter into the necessary explanations as a mean of healing the breach which had occurred between himself, Dr. Craik, & other of the friends & relatives of Washington. He complained sorely of the coolness, which he had experienced from those with whom he had been in long years of friendship & intimacy, prior to the conversation at Mt. Vernon; declined saying further on the subject of the Letters, but promised that he would write to me on his arrival at Boston. He wrote, but it was simply a most kind & affectionate adieu, and thus the character of the Letters, so far as Colo. Lear was concerned in developing the same, partake of the silence of his untimely grave.

To one who feels the devotional enthusiasm that I do for both men & things of the Revolution, it is with painfull regret that I disturb the ashes of the author of the Declaration of Independence, or of my old Master and early friend, who whatever may have been his faults (if any he had) towards others, was ever most kind to me. But truth my Dear Sir, "is mighty," and should allways prevail. The Lives & actions of distinguished men belong to their countries, and to History. No action in the long & meritorious life of the Great Washington, shuns the light, and the light and truth of History shall still beam upon the long hidden & mysterious affair of *The Letters* if I can dispel the darkness, so help me God, amen.

I am happy that you are about to anticipate my *Private Memoirs of the Life & Character of Washington*. The Public should be put in possession of the facts touching the *Letters*, & no one can doubt that *there were* Letters after the repeated & solemn declarations of Colo. Lear to that effect, to whose sole care was entrusted all the precious deposits of the Cheif, for History. The volumes of his public & private correspondence. Of the character of the Letters we have the evidence of Rawlins, who copied the same under the orders of the Cheif, and here it may be proper to be known, that Albin Rawlins was of respectable birth & connections, in the County of Caroline, State of Virginia, an intelligent, & amiable young man, whose correct moral deportment, pleasing manners, and attention to business, won for him the esteem of the whole Family of Mount Vernon, where he resided several years. Rawlins when questioned, declared that there were *three Letters* on the part of Washington, the first courteous, & a mere letter of enquiry. To this was returned an answer in the usually elegant style of Mr. Jefferson, who was assuredly the most finished epistolary writer of the age in which he flourished. In the second, the old Cheif pressed the Philosopher home, bringing him to the point of guilty or not guilty. The answer was said to be couched in terms of conciliation, spoke *much* of antient friendship, and of the long and happy intercourse & kindly reminiscences of by gone days. The last letter of Washington, to use the words of Rawlins, was awfull, so that R declared, my hand trembled as I wrote it down.

The subject of the Letters will be found at large & treated from facts only, in my *Recollections & Private Memoirs*, of the Life & Character of Washington, a work too long delayed from the American public, which has most kindly received various extracts from it, as published in the papers. My "poverty not my will" has heretofore prevented my visiting Europe, a mission indispensable to the completion of the work, & which I hope at no distant period to be able to accomplish. Enough is now elicited my Dr Sir, to convince the American Public, & the World, that *Letters did pass between Gen'l Washington & Mr Jefferson subsequent to the Letter to Mazzei.* And that the said *Letters of Washington were of no friendly character.*

Ever yrs

George W. P. Custis

P. S. Copy this badly written scrawl.

Addressed: Majr Lawrence Lewis, Audley, near Battle Town, Frederic County, Virginia.

Endorsed: "1832. G. W. P. Custis respecting correspondence between Genl Washington & Thos. Jefferson, confirming what I have stated on several occasions."

Notes.

A uniform series of reprints of standard historical novels is to be undertaken by Henry Holt & Co., and, "so far as practicable, the series will present a somewhat systematic general view of history"; always with regard to "high literary quality" as well as interest and (the most dubious item of the three) "trustworthiness." Some account of the author and his work will be given.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. promise for the coming autumn an *édition de luxe* of John Fiske's works; two compilations of Masterpieces of Greek and Latin Literature, respectively, chosen from the most famous English translations; a "Cambridge Edition" of the late Professor Child's 'English and Scotch Popular Ballads,' edited by his daughter, Miss Helen Child, with an introduction by Prof. George L. Kittredge; and 'A Study of Prose Fiction,' by Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*.

The late W. E. Channing's 'Thoreau, the Poet-Naturalist,' published by Roberts Brothers in 1873, and long since out of print, is to appear in a new and enlarged edition, edited by his literary exector, Mr. F. B. Sanborn. It will be brought out handsomely in October by Charles E. Goodspeed, Park Street, Boston, in two editions—the more expensive with extra illustrations.

'The Career and Conversation of John Swinton,' a sketch by his friend Robert Waters, will be published next month by the author in West Hoboken, N. J. (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.).

'De la Formation des Maîtres de l'Enseignement Secondaire à l'Étranger et en France,' par M. Dugard (Paris: Armand Colin), is one of the numerous publications which show how widespread, in all civilized countries, is the feeling of a need of better secondary schools. The author states the problem clearly and treats it in a systematic way. The book may be consulted with interest and profit.

The decline of Spain as a political Power and the loss of its prestige among modern nations in art and literature are now leading many thoughtful and patriotic Spaniards to inquire into the causes of this lamentable decay, and to suggest means of resuscitation and regeneration. Such is the purpose of a work of 207 pages, entitled 'Psicologia del Pueblo Español,' by Professor Altamira, the second volume of the "Biblioteca Moderna de Ciencias Sociales," a series of treatises on sociology now being published in Madrid. The author maintains that this national degeneracy is due not to any defects or incapacities inherent in the race, but to the imperfect development and systematic suppression of the superior qualities with which it is naturally endowed, and that a remedy must be sought in a more careful and general cultivation of the intellectual faculties. The state, under the influence of the Church, has grossly neglected popular education, and in many provinces, in which the public money is lavishly expended for bull-fights, the school-teachers are not paid even their meagre salaries, and are thus reduced to the ignominious choice between starvation and beggary.

The first volume of Dr. Ernst Steinmann's 'Die Sixtinische Kapelle,' just published by Bruckmann in Munich, describes the construction and decoration of this unique specimen of ecclesiastical architecture under Sixtus IV., and is an exceedingly valuable contribution to the history of the Renaissance in the latter half of the fifteenth century from a political as well as from an artistic point of view. The author is a German scholar residing in Rome, who has made a thorough study of the subject, and presents the results of his researches with remarkable completeness and (what is rare in German works of this kind) in a very attractive style. The text is profusely illustrated with excellent reproductions of the architectural details of the edifice and of the paintings of Perugino, Pinturicchio, Botticelli, Ghirlandajo, and other artists. The second and concluding volume will be devoted chiefly to Michelangelo.

"Municipal Socialism," the first title of the Consular Reports for July, is an interesting array of facts relating to the ownership by municipalities in England of public or semi-public enterprises, as street-railways, waterworks, etc., and to the housing of the poor who are dispossessed for sanitary reasons. This is the absorbing problem in Liverpool, which, "it is said, owns more revenue-producing real estate than any other municipality in the world; its income from this source being about half a million dollars a year." The report closes with two observations: "Speaking generally, municipal government in Great Britain is honest, intelligent, and energetic; and, as a rule, politics has but little to do with the engagement or retention of civic employees." The Antwerp Labor Exchange, whose recent opening is chronicled, is an outcome of the great dock strike two years ago. At that time a federation of employers and workmen was formed to protect and develop the interests of the shipping trade. The members, numbering now over 5,000, are "guaranteed an indemnity in case of lack of work, and mutual-benefit associations among the dockers are encouraged. . . . Never has there existed a more complete understanding between masters and men than under these conditions. Day work has now proved so efficacious that the necessity for overtime work has greatly diminished." The Exchange, a workman's club in fact, with lavatories and a dispensary, "furnishes at cost excellent beer, coffee, and tea, but no gin." The lack of forests in China leads our consul at Niuchwang to believe that there will be a permanent and extensive demand in that country for our Pacific Coast lumber. He states

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that "probably more wood is used for coffins than for any other purpose."

East of Asia is the title of a handsomely printed eighty-page magazine, 11x7 inches in dimensions, issued at Shanghai at the *North China Herald* office, and richly illustrated with reproductions from photographs showing how the Russian, German, and British occupation of parts of China is influencing architecture, the landscape, and the old landmarks. Dr. Arthur H. Smith writes on The New Peking, describing the fortified area of the legation district. Mr. C. F. Voskamp pictures brightly "the story-teller and his methods in China," where every common object grows myth and legend as a moist stone collects moss. Mr. L. Odontins's readable digest in German of the remarkable pamphlet of the reforming Viceroy or governor-general of the two Hu provinces is here put into English from the German. Mrs. Timothy Richards treats with woman's insight of Chinese social customs. There are articles, by competent hands, with reproductions of photographs taken this year, on the German Kiao-chau territory, on Port Arthur, the Russian place of occupation, and on Wei Hai Wei, the British portion; and between text and picture one gets a good idea of contemporaneous northeastern China. The plot of a Chinese play entitled "The Cattle Butcher's Retribution," and a spirited full-page colored print, make up a very attractive magazine interpreting modern China. Most striking of all the numerous illustrations is that of the cutting of the double eagle, with appropriate inscriptions (in both German and Chinese), deep into the face of the natural rock at Tsingtao, on the spot where the first German troop, under the command of Admiral von Diederichs, took possession in 1897.

Strikingly illustrative of the methods and spirit of the rival political parties and leaders in Japan that are to measure their strength at the polls during August, 1902, is the literary magazine the *Waseda Bungaku*. About twenty years ago Count Okuma—incorrigible optimist and "martyr to the cause of the foreigner in Japan," ex-Premier and cabinet officer, who founded and has been for years the leader and oracle of the Progressive party—established the School of Literature, Politics and Law at Waseda, in Tokio. He has made it by his ability and energy a worthy rival, in some respects at least, of the Imperial University. Everything is taught in Japanese by native professors, except English and Chinese. The object is to educate Japanese young men and women thoroughly in the three literatures and languages most needed in this generation. In coöperation with the school is a translation and publishing department—long conducted at a loss, but now more than paying its expenses—which puts the substantial modern literature of many countries (chiefly English, French, and German) into excellent Japanese. Of the several hundred copies of the *Waseda* monthly magazine that have passed under our review, that for June, 1902, is typical. In the list of works noted in this literary digest we find the names of Dicey, Barton ('Semitic Origins'), Dunning ('Political Theories'), Hanna ('The Scotch-Irish'), Brandes, De Nolhac, Helmholt ('Weltgeschichte'), Jacquemot, Kröger, and others, whose works are translated in part or commented upon, besides those by Chinese and Japanese authors. Some of the numbers contain critical articles on Japanese topics—political (but non-partisan), legal, economic, and literary—which are invaluable to the scholar in Japanese. Twenty thousand copies of this literary magazine are distributed monthly.

"Kikuyu," by Major R. Crawshay, the most noteworthy article in the *Geographical Journal* for July, is an account of a district on the Uganda Railway. He draws a most attractive picture of the little villages "with their toy-house-like granaries with tiny conical roofs," surrounded by herds of cattle and flocks of sheep and goats, the men and women at work in the plantations, the boys herding the live stock, the innumerable fires lighted for no other purpose than the companionship of their smoke. The people, an unusually manly and intelligent race, differ from the neighboring tribes in having a patriarchal form of government with graded punishments for various crimes, in their morality, their industry, their trustworthiness, and their splendid physique. They also are exceptional in that "they have none of that wild-beast-like craving for meat for which the majority of African tribes are so famous. . . . They eat no other flesh than that of domestic cattle, sheep, and goats." Their vice is drunkenness. In an account of the recent eruptions in the West Indies, Mr. H. N. Dickson infers, from the reports of earthquakes in April and May in both hemispheres, "probably one of the most profound and widespread disturbances which have affected the earth's crust within historic times." Mr. E. André gives the results of his observations of St. Vincent, in the course of which he says "the whole country looks as if millions of barrels of cement had been emptied over it." Referring to Dr. Sven Hedin's return from "one of the most remarkable and successful expeditions ever undertaken in Central Asia," Sir Clements Markham says that "his maps alone, if spread out, would cover nearly a quarter of a mile." The principal maps, accompanied by notes, are of the glaciers of Kangchenjunga and of Lake Nyasa.

It is nearly a century and a half since Voltaire wrote to Rousseau the letter in which he acknowledges the receipt of the 'Discours sur l'Inégalité' and so wittily defends letters and science against Rousseau's attack. Those who imagine that no such defence is called for in our own day would be surprised at the seriousness and ability with which the German teachers, at their recent meeting in Chemnitz, discussed the subject of "The Importance of Popular Education to the Morality of the People." The proceedings of the meeting of this largest of all teachers' associations—its membership amounts to 85,000—are published in recent numbers of the *Paedagogische Zeitung*, and show that it is still important for the friends of popular education to meet the arguments of its enemies, new and old. The stenographic reports are full of interesting historical facts and well-taken points. We can here mention only the statement of an old prison teacher, who said that, during his twenty-five years of service, he had found that, of all the criminals under his instruction, only one-fourth were in possession of what might be called a satisfactory education.

In Germany even novelists are obliged to be savants. At any rate, one gets that impression on reading about the examination which Paul Heyse passed at the University of Berlin, fifty years ago. Becker questioned him about Romance literature and language, Trendelenburg about Spinoza, Boeckh about Greek literature, conversing with him in Latin, Ranke on the history of Spain and the Crusades, Von Hagen on the history of German poetry. The result of the examination was a "multa cum laude" for Heyse. His dissertation was entitled 'Studia Romanensia,' and the special theses he had to maintain orally related to Goethe's 'Wilhelm Meister,' to Spinoza, and to Michelangelo. What would happen to our American novelists under similar circumstances?

In a recent academical address, Professor Hjelt, Rector of the University of Helsingfors in Finland, gave an interesting account of the education of women in that institution. The first female student was a young girl, who passed the required examination and was matriculated in 1870. A serious obstacle to the movement was a decision made by the Russian Government in 1882 that no woman should be admitted without special permission, in each individual case, from the authorities in St. Petersburg. The result of this bureaucratic regulation was that only seventeen women entered the University during the next eight years. In 1890, men and women were placed on an equal footing in this respect, in consequence of which the number of women applicants rapidly increased, so that till now 749 have pursued their studies at Helsingfors; at present they number 120, and form nearly a fourth of the whole body of students. Professor Hjelt regards coeducation in Helsingfors as a success. The presence of young women in the lecture-rooms has exerted a wholesome influence and promoted the proficiency of the young men in learning. Only two women have studied theology; 7 per cent. have devoted themselves to jurisprudence, 65 per cent. to history and philology, and 28 per cent. to physics and mathematics. The women excel in modern languages, æsthetics, literature, and history; but their average standing in philosophy is not as high as that of the young men. The instances of superiority in mathematics are striking, but exceptional.

A twofold service was rendered to literature by the late Mr. C. Kegan Paul, who will be remembered both as an author and as a publisher. His best-known books were biographical—the 'Life of Godwin,' 'Biographical Sketches,' and 'Memories.' The second of these consisted of a series of valuable critical memoirs of Edward Irving, Keble, Maria Hare, Rowland Williams, Kingsley, George Eliot, and Newman, of most of whom Mr. Kegan Paul had personal knowledge. When the development of his Positivist views—to be succeeded later by submission to the Church of Rome—resulted in the resignation of his position as an Anglican clergyman, he became literary adviser of Mr. Henry S. King, in which capacity he had much to do with the production of the International Scientific Series. Later he associated himself with a son of Archbishop Trench in the purchase of Mr. King's business, and remained the managing director when it was transformed into a company under the name of Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. His 'Memories' contains many interesting particu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lars of his relations with Tennyson, Bagehot, and many other prominent men of letters, as well as some lively recollections of the perils to which a publisher is exposed. On the business, as a whole, however, he pronounces the judgment that, "supposing any one to have the capital and the literary skill, I can imagine no more interesting work."

—The August *Century* has some fifty pages of interesting matter on earthquakes and volcanoes in general, and the Martinique and St. Vincent disasters in particular. The opening paper of the group is by Professor Kemp of Columbia University, who goes extensively into the causes of seismic and volcanic action. This is followed by a vivid description of the Martinique catastrophe in the form of a detailed report to the Bishop of Martinique, absent in Paris at the time, by the Vicar-General of the island, the Very Rev. G. Parel, whose sense of duty to the people under his care freed him of all fear and kept him alert to all that was going on. Another valuable addition to the record was secured for the *Century* by the chaplain of the *Dixie*, in the form of a file of the leading newspaper of St. Pierre, *Les Colonies*, for the week immediately preceding the disaster. Several pages of extracts from this paper are printed, and they warrant the conviction that it was for a time the policy of the editor to belittle the real danger. The St. Vincent disaster is described by two eye-witnesses, Capt. Calder, Chief of Police of St. Vincent, and T. McGregor McDonald, owner of one of the most famous plantations of the island. The group fitly closes with a translation of the two famous letters in which the younger Pliny describes to Tacitus the great eruption of Vesuvius in the year 79. Still further papers are to be added in the September issue. Aside from this collection, the most important feature of the number is "The Tragedy of the Range," Mr. Baker's continuation of his series of papers on the Southwest. It is a story of almost incredible mismanagement and waste of great natural resources, due no more to the folly and ignorance of the immediate agents than to the lack of concern manifested by the legislative and executive departments of the United States Government.

—Martha Baker Dunn, in the August *Atlantic*, writes helpfully of "The Browning Tonic," but the logic of her argument is spoiled in the end by a mistaken application. Courage and endurance are good qualities, and the soldiers in the Cuban war doubtless displayed them in as great a measure as was possible when fighting for a dubious cause; but it does no honor to these qualities to invoke them in behalf of an attitude of silence towards suffering produced, not by the real necessities of warfare, but by the incompetence and dishonesty of officers employed to provide the men in the field with such food, clothing, medical attendance, etc., as will make them most efficient in the work they are set to do. An article on the poetry of Edward Rowland Sill, signed "W. B. P.," might easily be understood as distinctly unfavorable, but is better considered as showing the solid worth of the poet by calling attention to the disadvantages against which his fame is steadily making its way. Verner Z. Reed contributes some entertaining moral and sentimental reflections on the Desert, a subject which has taken a strong hold on the imagination of magazine writers, assisted, no doubt, by the recent volume of Prof. John C. Van Dyke. While Mr. Reed draws from the desert solitude the thought that "whatever is is right," it is the temper of the age to draw from its material unproductiveness the idea that the desert itself is all wrong, and to proceed *vi et armis* to reduce it to cultivation.

—It may seem quixotic to recommend to the "summer reader" any rival to the "superb vitality" of Dorothy Vernon of Haddon Hall; yet if the summer reader has not parted with all his good sense and good taste and his intelligent curiosity as to the human comedy, he may well be allured by a modest and charming volume which has no fault except that it is instructive as well as amusing and entertaining. The title of this, we hardly dare to say, is 'Translations from Lucian,' by Miss Augusta M. Campbell Davidson, M.A. (Longmans, Green & Co.). If Lucian's vogue is on the wane, as Miss Davidson observes, it may be partly because he has been superseded, in a way, by Voltaire; but the Attic sauce with which his dissertations are served up might pique the appetite of the most jaded and indolent mind. The reader who glances into this ancient mirror of a decadent age—if he has a grain of sense and seriousness in his composition—will see in it the reflection of our own times—our fashionable fads and crazes, our scepticism dashed and mingled with the grossest superstition; he will recognize that his own generation consists largely of Lucian's "dead people warmed over," as Dr. Holmes used to say; only the clothes and the scenery are just a little different. We need hardly go back to the memoirs of Mme. Roland to parallel the sycophancy and snobbery and bad manners that are pictured in the sketch of the sorrows and trials of "Paid Companions," nor to a Cagliostro to match the magnificent impudence and world-wide success of that juggler and impostor, Alexander of Abonoteichus, whose astounding career is described in one of these excerpts. As to his dupes, are they not the same people as our neighbors on the next street, if not our own friends and intimates? Besides these lively sketches, Miss Davidson has included "The Sale of Philosophers," "The Orator's Guide," "Hermotimus," the delightful bit of satire and burlesque entitled "Zeus the Tragedian," and also "The True History," a witty and fanciful extravaganza, the precursor of Munchausen, which possibly suggested some ideas for Swift's Gulliver.

—As to the quality of Miss Davidson's translation, there can hardly be two opinions. It is the work, so to speak, of a lady and a scholar—a rather remarkable specimen of well-bred, racy English, which recalls the letters of Dorothy Osborne. It is characterized by ease, urbanity, sprightliness, and an unfailing fluency of idiom without the slightest taint of slang. It reveals great skill and ingenuity in turning the phrases of a highly idiomatic writer so successfully that it reads like an original, not constrained by any foreign mould. It is naturally somewhat free, and occasionally becomes a discreet paraphrase; but it is entirely adequate for the purposes of the public for whom it was designed. We regret that we cannot illustrate these virtues at length; but, as literature, we can commend Miss Davidson's workmanship to the attention of our own Ph.D.'s, masculine and feminine, who are too apt to scorn culture in their wooing of science, and, while learning foreign languages, to forget how to write their own.

—In the *Annales* of the Paris International Congress of 1900 that discussed Comparative History, the report of the fifth section, concerned with the History of Science, contains nothing of greater consequence than one might expect as the printed residuum of such a meeting, after the separate publication of several contributions. The leading spirit of the section was evidently M. Paul Tannery. Heiberg prints for the first time the Greek text of Anatolius on the first ten numbers, a Pythagorean Christian tract by an Alexandrian Peripatetic of the third century. It contains an otherwise unknown fragment of Heraclitus, and has a certain interest as probably representing a lost book of Nicomachus. Several of the longer papers of the volume relate to mediæval medicine and surgery; and there is one by Nicaise on the state of anatomy and physiology at the time of Vesalius and Harvey. Tannery prints nine letters addressed to the celebrated Père Mersenne, who, at the time of Descartes, acted as a medium of scientific intelligence. Sigismund Günther gives an interesting account of the different compromises between Ptolemy and Copernicus that were proposed in the sixteenth and later centuries. In a paper by André Lalande, the pendulum of opinion about Francis Bacon swings to so wide a deflection that Descartes is almost represented to have borrowed from him the idea of explaining all physics on mechanical principles. It is the 'Valerius Terminus' to which appeal is made for support of this. Galitzyne communicates letters and pictorial sketches sent to Catharine II. in 1783 by the Russian Minister in Paris, to inform her about the ballooning exploits of Montgolfier and Charles. There are some interesting papers about Comtism; for the rest, not very much to attract other readers than minute students in special departments of the history of science.

—In the Historical section of the *Annales* the Abbé Pierling investigates a curious incident in the career of the False Dmitri, who, in 1605, after the death of Boris Godunoff, succeeded in imposing himself on Russia as the son of Ivan the Terrible, who had died in 1584. At Cracow, in 1604, the Pretender, in the hands of the Jesuit Sawicki, had professed Catholicism, and abjured the Orthodox faith; he had promised to render Russia Catholic and to lead a crusade against the Turks. To insure the success of his enterprise, however, his apostasy had to be kept secret, and he hoped to procure a papal dispensation to enable him to take, from the Orthodox Patriarch, the communion which was an essential feature of his coronation. Rome delayed, however, and Sawicki was distracted with doubt, both as to this and the complications that would inevitably follow. He consulted the nuncio at Cracow, and the latter referred the question to the Roman Holy Office. Dmitri was crowned July 31, and must have taken the Eucharist from the hand of a heretic (which was unpardonable), while the Inquisition dallied, and it was not until November 5 that it evaded

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decision by telling Sawicki that he must consult the canons and act according to his conscience. Then the question presented itself anew, for Dmitri had promised to marry Marina, daughter of George Mniszek, Palatin of Sendomir, a powerful Polish magnate, who had aided his enterprise. She, of course, was a Catholic, and at her coronation she too would be expected to take the sacrament. Mniszek assembled a trio of theologians, who concluded that Dmitri should be urged to omit the communion in the ceremony, and that Rome should be asked to grant a dispensation in view of the enormous advantages anticipated for the Church. On the one hand, Dmitri succeeded in suppressing the communion at the coronation of his bride; on the other, as evasion would no longer serve, the Inquisition again examined the question thoroughly, and in a solemn session held March 2, 1606, under the presidency of Paul V., it decided adversely with but one dissenting vote. In this it proved to be wise, for prolonged dissimulation would have been useless, seeing that Dmitri was put to death on May 17, and with him vanished the dreams of subjecting Russia to the Holy See.

ROSE'S NAPOLEON I.

The Life of Napoleon I. Including new material from the British Official Records. By John Holland Rose, M.A. The Macmillan Co. 1902. 2 vols., pp. 471, 547.

Now that impartiality is looked upon as a prime virtue of the historian, a new field is thrown open to the English biographer. It becomes legitimate for him to write about Napoleon in any one of several forms. If learned, he may prepare a work of erudition for specialists; if well informed, he may dispel many prejudices which still haunt the mind of the general reader; and even if he be a mere bookmaker, he will deserve to escape the reproaches of the reviewer so long as he approaches the subject with a mind unwarped by patriotic prejudice. In the moments which immediately followed his first abdication, Napoleon spoke thus of England. To Caulaincourt he said: "She has done me much harm, doubtless, but I have left in her flanks a poisoned dart. It is I who have made this debt, that will ever burden, if not crush, future generations." A century after the Peace of Amiens that debt has not been paid, and perhaps there will be a survival of rancor in the English heart until the distant day when the nation shall have cleared off the last account which can be laid to the charge of the "Corsican usurper." In the meantime it would be unreasonable to expect from the generality of Englishmen any outburst of hero-worship. Under existing circumstances, the historical spirit wins a notable victory whenever an isolated scholar in Great Britain comes forward to treat the career and character of Napoleon with fairness.

As a mere academic statement, this may sound trite, but it is necessary that some such comment should precede any detailed review of Mr. Rose's work. From a great variety of passages, some general and some minute, one can see how carefully the author has sought to guard against prepossessions of whatever kind. Mr. Fyffe, by the degree of his antagonism to Napoleon, recalls the days of Scott and Alison. Freeman, going farther still, recalls the suggestion which the *Times* made when the *Bellerophon* arrived at Torbay: "The first procedure, we trust, will be a special Commission, or the appointment of a court-martial, to try him for the murder of Capt. Wright." Dr. Fitchett, whose volumes circulate widely, informs us that "Napoleon's amazing success is not explained by his intellectual gifts. His epoch explains his career. An exhausted Revolution needed a military dictator and was certain to crystallize into one. If Napoleon had not played that part, Moreau [*sic*] would, or Hoche, or Bernadotte." Such is the attitude of recent well-known writers in England.

On the contrary, Mr. Rose holds his balance with a firm and even hand. We have mentioned Fyffe, Freeman, and Fitchett. There remain the late Sir John Seeley and Mr. Goldwin Smith, from both of whom Mr. Rose dissociates himself. With a fuller knowledge of Napoleonic literature than has yet been shown by any Englishman, he has a graver sense of the inherent difficulties and a clearer determination to face the thousand problems of fact and motive. While on the one hand he escapes from the bias of inherited antipathy, he succeeds, more conspicuously than Lord Rosebery has done, in keeping his mind free from the overmastery of Napoleon's genius. If Mr. Rose's views have been deeply affected by those of any contemporary, we should venture to conjecture that he has felt the touch of the late Lord Acton, who receives the dedication, and whose article on Napoleon in the second volume of the *English Historical Review* discloses much of the same spirit.

We dilate upon this aspect of the work because, where it is a question of the Reformation, the French Revolution, or Napoleon, everything depends upon the animus, the point of view. Mr. Rose confronts as delicate and hazardous a subject as Dr. Creighton did when he set out to write the history of the Papacy during the period of the Reformation. They are alike, also, in learning and openness of mind. It is therefore interesting to see that Mr. Rose concludes his preface with the following words: "That I have escaped altogether the pitfalls with which the subject abounds is not to be imagined; but I can honestly say, in the words of the late Bishop of London, that 'I have tried to write true history.'"

Napoleon and his age are so important, while among all the books which have been written about them so few are really good, that it is a duty to single out and praise the rare work of merit when it appears. Mr. Rose has won high honor where most fail lamentably or absurdly. Though his special researches may have been less arduous than those of Chuquet and Vandal, of Houssaye and Lumbroso, he has made his original contribution to knowledge of fact, and, by gathering up the results of a thousand monographs into a connected biography, he takes his place beside Fournier. Thus, while he helps to redeem his countrymen from the reproach of having studied Napoleon casually and in a wrong spirit, he has produced a book that will be of great value to all who speak English. It deserves moreover, to be translated into the languages of Continental Europs. We shall not overpraise Mr. Rose by saying that he has produced a Thucydidean classic, or that his view of Napoleon will convert the world. He has written, in the narrative form, at which, he says, history ought always to aim, a learned and thoughtful, a compact yet animated, account of Napoleon's life.

Having thus referred to Mr. Rose's outlook and attainment, we may now pass to the subject of his own independent research. He says in the preface: "I should not have ventured on this great undertaking, had I not been able to contribute something new to Napoleonic literature. During a study of this period for an earlier work ['The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era'], published in the 'Cambridge Historical Series,' I ascertained the great value of the British Records for the years 1795-1815." Drawing from the War Office and Admiralty Records and from the Foreign-Office Archives, he has carried out an investigation which has already been pursued in the case of Russia, Austria, and Prussia. The importance of this quest for Napoleonic material in British instructions, dispatches, and reports is supported by a passage taken from M. Lévy's 'Napoléon Intime': "The documentary history of the wars of the Empire has not yet been written. To write it accurately, it will be more important thoroughly to know foreign archives than those of France." Mr. Rose's comment upon this quotation runs: "I think that I may claim to have searched all the important parts of our Foreign Office Archives for the years in question, as well as for part of the St. Helena period."

Here no allusion is made to what Mr. Rose has discovered in British state papers regarding the period of the Consulate. Yet, like Mr. Bowman, he has examined the Peace of Amiens in the light of information gained from this source, and he has found something new about the part of British officials in the Royalist Plot of 1804. As the conspiracy of Pichegru and Georges Cadoudal was the immediate means of raising Napoleon to the purple, the incident has some significance of its own, while it illustrates forcibly the First Consul's methods of meeting his enemies, and the mental feebleness of the Addington administration. Mr. Rose calls it "the most famous plot of the century," and the fresh facts which he has established deserve to be selected as an example of his diligence.

During 1803-04 two plots were in progress at the same time. The Comte d'Artois and other leaders of the *émigrés*, with certain allies in France, were seeking to effect the assassination of Napoleon; and he, watching their stupid manœuvres, with all the confidence of superior skill, was trying to enlarge the circle of the conspirators until it should include some of his most formidable opponents. By the help of Mehée de la Touche, a skilful *agent provocateur*, Fouché kept the First Consul informed, "while he also wove his meshes round plotting *émigrés*, English officials, and French generals." What has repeatedly been alleged, on the authority of memoirs and other evidence of varying quality, Mr. Rose now proves from British archives, namely, that British officials were guilty of helping forward Pichegru's scheme. Among the Foreign Office Records there is a letter (August 30, 1803) from the Baron de Roll, a Bourbon emissary, to Mr. Hammond, Permanent Under Secretary of the Foreign Office, asking him to call on the Comte d'Artois

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at his residence, No. 46 Baker Street. During October of the same year, a secret memorandum follows, in which the Comte d'Artois reviews Bonaparte's career, showing how, at the present moment, all the leading generals and politicians of France are against him. Active complicity is proved by a document of November 18, wherein is noted the payment made by the British Government to royalist officers "who had set out or were ready to set out." "Another 'most secret' Admiralty letter, of January 9, 1804, orders a frigate or large sloop to be got ready to convey secretly 'an officer of rank and consideration' (probably Pichegru) to the French coast. Wright carried over the conspirators in several parties, until chance threw him into Napoleon's power and consigned him to an ignominious death, probably suicide." Finally, Mr. Arbuthnot, Parliamentary Secretary at the Foreign Office, wrote to Sir Arthur Paget (March 12, 1804) about the "sad result of all our fine projects for the reëstablishment of the Bourbons: . . . we are, of course, greatly apprehensive for poor Moreau's safety."

In view of these facts, Mr. Rose brushes away all ministerial denials. Perhaps it was a plot which embraced young and hotheaded officials rather than the respectable chiefs. Perhaps it may be slightly condoned by a French plot of the same kind against George III. "But," Mr. Rose concludes, "when all is said, the British Government must stand accused of one of the most heinous of crimes. The whole truth was not known at Paris, but it was surmised; and the surmise was sufficient to envenom the whole course of the struggle between England and Napoleon."

When he comes to the wars of the Empire, Mr. Rose is likewise able to increase previous knowledge by details that he has drawn from the British records. These are especially interesting for the war of the Third Coalition, during the course of which Napoleon won such brilliant victories over Continental troops supported by English subsidies. We can hardly say that the new evidence thus gathered will cause many verdicts of history to be reversed, but it is always interesting and often valuable. Napoleon is the subject of the book, not British diplomacy; yet few of the incidental topics are so important as the latter. In the end, after ridiculous inconsistencies, the British Foreign Office came to have a settled policy.

"Nevertheless," says Mr. Rose, "the splendor of the finale must not blind us to the flaccid eccentricities that made British statesmanship the laughing-stock of Europe in 1801-3, 1806-7, and 1809. Indeed, it is questionable whether the renewal of the war between England and Napoleon in 1803 was due more to his innate forcefulness or to the contempt which he felt for the Addington Cabinet. When one also remembers our extraordinary blunders in the War of the Third Coalition, it seems a miracle that the British Empire survived that life-and-death struggle against a man of superhuman genius who was determined to effect its overthrow."

We would not have it inferred from what has been said that Mr. Rose exalts Napoleon's relations with Great Britain above everything else in his career. The duel between the Emperor and England is but one feature, however striking, in an experience of unparalleled activity and diversity. Mr. Rose has studied a particular aspect of the subject more thoroughly than any of his predecessors, and this fact we have sought to bring out. At the same time he writes a remarkably well-modelled biography, in which the English element is given no more than its due share. The first volume closes with the collapse of the Boulogne flotilla; the second extends from the campaign of Ulm and Austerlitz to the last hour at St. Helena. If any period has, of conscious purpose, been treated briefly, it is that which comes between 1809 and 1811, when imperial prestige reached its height. Everything essential has been discussed—origin and training, personal and family relations, wars, political aptitudes, the creation of institutions, contact with the Revolution, effect upon European statecraft, character and genius. These things have been taken up by Mr. Rose, not in a loose and nebulous way, or as affording themes for phrases, but with a sure grasp of fact and in stern subordination to a well-wrought plan. If necessary, he can stop to tell a story, even though the telling occupies a whole page—as in the case where he relates how Joseph and Lucien tried to dissuade Napoleon from parting with Louisiana. The story is a good one, but it is not told merely because it is an amusing anecdote.

In any life of Napoleon war must fill a large share of the space, and for this reason the author is sure to feel at a great disadvantage unless he has received special training in military history. Mr. Rose cannot claim to have the grasp of strategy and tactics which the late Mr. Ropes possessed, and we imagine that he would be the last to suggest such a comparison. He writes of war like the intelligent amateur who, after comparing the judgments of the best experts, has used common sense in reaching a conclusion of his own. The campaigns are fully described and with admirable clearness. Even where a moot point arises, like the share of Augereau in the credit for Castiglione, or the reconstruction of what actually took place at Marengo, or Napoleon's mistake in the disposition of his forces just before the battles of Jena and Auerstädt, Mr. Rose is not afraid to state his opinion, since it has been formed after a careful scrutiny of the evidence.

We shall not try to state in a single word what Mr. Rose's attitude is towards either the genius or the character of Napoleon. These are complex questions which cannot be disposed of with a plain yes or no. But there is one manifest disposition of the writer that can be briefly indicated. Mr. Rose is fond of analysis and the investigation of motives, yet at times he reaches the point where he stops short in a mood of pious agnosticism. For example, he will not decide definitely whether in 1805 Napoleon planned his expedition for Ireland seriously, or whether he simply meant it for a feint while he dealt the chief blow at London.

"Both Nelson and Collingwood believed him to be aiming at Ireland. But Napoleon is often unfathomable. Herein lies much of the charm of Napoleonic studies. He is at once the Achilles, the Mercury, and the Proteus of the modern world. The ease with which his mind grasped all new problems and suddenly concentrated its force on some new plan, may well perplex posterity as it dazed his contemporaries."

And again, after describing the wonderful battles of February, 1814, he says:

"Whatever the mistakes of these leaders, and they were great, there is something that defies analysis in Napoleon's sudden transformation of his beaten, dispirited band into a triumphant array before which four times their numbers sought refuge in retreat. But it is just this transcendent equality that adds a charm to the character and career of Napoleon. Where analysis fails, there genius begins."

Finally, Mr. Rose does not blink the Emperor's shortcomings, but he grows eloquent over his achievements. It is in the following strain that this thorough and mature work closes:

"The man who bridled the Revolution and remoulded the life of France, who laid broad and deep the foundations of a new life in Italy, Switzerland, and Germany, who rolled the West in on the East in the greatest movement known since the crusades, and finally drew the yearning thoughts of myriads to that solitary rock in the South Atlantic, must ever stand in the very forefront of the immortals of human story."

The Service. By Henry David Thoreau. Edited by F. B. Sanborn. Boston: Charles E. Goodspeed. 1902.

The brief article which Mr. Sanborn has had so handsomely printed (500 copies on French hand-made paper and 20 on Japan), has had a curious and interesting history. It was sent by Thoreau to the *Dial*, bearing the date July, 1840, the same as that of the first number of the *Dial*, in which he made a double appearance, in poetry and in prose. Margaret Fuller, then one of the editors of the *Dial*, turned it over to Emerson, one of her two associates, with a comment intended for Thoreau, which probably he never saw. She found it full of thoughts, but these so out of their natural order that she could not read it without pain.

"It is true," she continued, "as Mr. Emerson says, that essays not to be compared with this have found their way into the *Dial*. But then these were more unassuming in their tone, and have an air of quiet good-breeding which induces us to permit their presence. Yours is so rugged that it ought to be commanding."

Whence it appears that Emerson desired its publication, but, on becoming sole editor of the *Dial*, the courage of his opinion was not equal to the act he had advised. After Emerson's death, the manuscript found its way somehow into Mr. Sanborn's hands, and now the stone which the lapidaries rejected has been set in a manner equal to, if not beyond, its just deserts.

It will add nothing to Thoreau's reputation, but it will furnish the critics of Transcendentalism with one of their most striking illustrations of its occasional extravagance. Here is a kind of writing which makes the most unintelligible passages of the earlier Emerson seem miracles of clarity. Jeremiah Mason would have been twice confounded by it, and hardly could his "gals" have understood it. Here are colors floated off from Emerson's palette, and here are the stiffness and the involution of English prose before Dryden took it in hand. As for the militant rhetoric, Mr. Sanborn considers this a counterblast to the peace sermons that were getting written in 1840 and about that time. One of the most notable of Channing's had appeared in 1839.

The article has a triple division, the first part being headed "Qualities of the Recruit," the second, "What Music Shall We Have?" the third, "Not How Many, but

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where the Enemy Are." There is evidence on every page of Thoreau's familiarity with natural things and with classic literature. But the natural things seem to exist for him only as symbols of spiritual realities, their frank concreteness affording him no such relish as it did further on. That playing upon words and that delight in paradox which were ever his besetting sins, have here some of their grossest exhibitions, and these sins are mingled strangely with some of the rarest virtues of his thought and style. For example:

"They who are alarmed lest virtue should so far demean herself as to be extremely good, have not yet wholly embraced her, but described only a slight arc of a few seconds about her, and from so small and ill-defined a curvature you can calculate no centre whatever; but their mean is no better than meanness, nor their medium than mediocrity."

And this for paradox:

"What shame, then, that our lives, which might so well be the source of planetary motion, and sanction the order of the spheres, should be full of abruptness and angularity so as not to roll nor move majestically!"

There are sentences and passages of singular beauty, and some of great nobility and splendor, while others jostle them that are absurd either in their expression or in their thought, as where Thoreau finds that "the grand and majestic have always somewhat of the undulatoriness of the sphere," and declares that this is "the secret of majesty in the rolling gait of the elephant, and of all grace in action and in art." He instances the great Tippecanoe and Tyler ball which the grave citizens of Concord rolled from the Concord battle-ground to Bunker Hill. "I seem," he says, "to discover each striving to imitate its gait and keep step with it, if possible to swell to its own diameter." Doubtless Van Buren Democrats, witnessing the same phenomena, gave them a different interpretation, fancying an excessive use of the hard cider of that silliest of all political campaigns. But the main intent is admirable—a variant of Emerson's self-reliance and Channing's greatness of the soul—and there is much striking illustration.

"A man's life," we read, "should be a stately march to an unheard music; and when to its fellows it may seem irregular and inharmonious, he will be stepping to a livelier measure which only his nicer ear can detect. There will be no halt, ever, but at most a marching on his post, or such a pause as is richer than any sounds, when the deeper melody is no longer heard, but implicitly consented to with the whole life and being. He will never take a false step, even in the most arduous circumstances; for then the music will not fail to swell into greater volume, and rule the movement it inspired."

With the Wild Geese. By Emily Lawless. With an Introduction by Stopford A. Brooke, M.A. London: Isbister & Co. Pp. xxvi, 95.

Miss Lawless is rightly esteemed one of the best authors of modern Irish fiction, if not the best. She here appears as a poet. The contents of this volume have, it appears, already been handed around in privately printed form. It is due to Mr. Brooke's persuasion that they are now given to the public, upon condition that he "would write a preface to them which should explain certain matters—among the rest the title of the book—to those English readers to whom Irish history is an unknown wilderness." The preface is not only an explanation necessary for such readers, but a warm appreciation of the work.

"Wild Geese" is the name given to those Irish exiles who, "like the wild birds and with their wailing cry, migrated to the Continent before and after the battle of Aughrim and the surrender of Limerick in 1691." Between that date and 1745, 150,000 Irishmen are said to have died in the service of France alone. Others fought for Spain and Austria.

"No words that I have read," says Mr. Brooke, "have realized with more insight and sympathy the temper of these daring, high-bred, honorable, reckless, and sorrowful men than those with which Miss Lawless has clothed the bitterness of their exile, their passion for fighting, and their longing for their native land."

Besides a fine prefatory address to the Atlantic, laving the shores from which most of the "wild geese" took flight, we are given eight poems on the author's main theme, two dirges on the Desmond War, six themes suggested by life in the Aran Islands, and five miscellaneous pieces. The intensity of feeling and passion in many of these will, at least to those who have felt deeply about Ireland, suggest the spirit running through 'Childe Harold.' The collection opens with a poem of seven stanzas entitled "After Aughrim," in which Ireland is supposed to speak:

"She said, 'They gave me of their best,
They lived, they gave their lives for me;
I tossed them to the howling waste,
And flung them to the foaming sea.'

. . . . . .

"She said, 'Ten times they fought for me,
Ten times they strove with might and main,
Ten times I saw them beaten down,
Ten times they rose, and fought again.'

. . . . . .

"She said, 'God knows they owe me nought,
I tossed them to the foaming sea,
I tossed them to the howling waste,
Yet still their love comes home to me.'"

Two poems are entitled "Fontenoy"—one describing the joy of the weary Irish soldiers at the prospect of engaging their English foes; the other the weird return to Ireland of the spirit of the victorious dead:

"*Jesus save you gently! why are ye so white*
Sitting all so straight and still in this misty light?"
"Nothing ails us, brother; joyous souls are we,
Sailing home together on the morning sea."

A lovely address, "To a Tuft of White Bog-Cotton, Growing in the Tyrol," is in a different strain from most of the other pieces. We quote the first of the seven stanzas:

"And is it *thou*, small playmate of the fens,
Child of damp haunts and pallid sea-borne fogs,
Light flutterer over dank and oozy glens,
White-tufted, starry friend of Irish bogs!
What dost *thou*, tossed upon this mountain here,
Flaunting thy white crest in this alien air?
Thy little pennon swelled by this loud breeze
Far out of reach of every low compeer;
Far from thy barren moor lands, waste and bare,
And distant moan of sullen Celtic seas."

The last piece closes with the hope of Ireland's future:

"I see her in those coming days,
Still young, still gay; her unbound hair
Crowned with a crown of starlike rays,
Serenely fair.
I see an envied haunt of peace,
Calm and untouched; remote from roar,
Where wearied men may from their burdens cease
On a still shore."

We are mistaken if this volume, attractive in its typography as in its contents, be not destined to take a permanent place on the bookshelves of lovers of Ireland.

Forest Neighbors. By William Davenport Hulbert. McClure, Phillips & Co.

Biographies of a beaver, a brook trout, a lynx, a porcupine, a loon, and a deer make up this book. Though the author vouches for some of the incidents, he does not say that he has drawn his material from the life of any particular animal which he has known, or that he has made a composite sketch of several such lives; he appears, rather, to have combined experiences common or possible to the kind in a bit of clever fiction that does not contradict scientific truth. The book gives evidence of reading and observation joined with marked perception of the conditions of an animal's life, and considerable skill in portraying them. Even the seasoned reader of nature stories gets here a fresh realization of the animal's struggle for existence, in which it must hold out against hunger, accident, disease, the rivalry of its own species, and the violence of predatory animals and hostile man. The pain and fear of the trapped creature come home to one sharply in the stories of the beaver and the lynx. Without sermonizing, the book quickens sympathy and makes cruelty hateful. "The King of the Trout Stream" contains good work in embryology, and is perhaps the best illustration of the author's knowledge of natural history and his ability to show the interesting side of even an unpromising subject. "The Making of a Glimmerglass Buck" is the most dramatic of the stories. It ends with an unusual incident:

"As he [the buck] neared the spring, treading noiselessly on the soft moss, he heard two little clicks, and stopped short to see what they meant. Both were quick and sharp, and both had come exactly at the same instant; yet they were not quite alike, for one had come from the shutter of a camera, and one from the lock of a rifle. Across the salt lick a photographer and a hunter were facing each other in the darkness, and each saw the gleam of the other's eyes and took him for a deer. . . .

"The buck stood and watched, and suddenly there came two bursts of flame—one of them so big and bright that it lit the woods like sheet-lightning. . . . The flash-light printed on the sensitive plate a picture of a hunter in the act of firing, and the rifle sent a bullet straight through the photographer's forehead. The buck saw it all as in a dream—the white flame of the magnesium powder; the rifle belching out its fire and smoke; the camera, silent and harmless, but working just as surely; the two men, each straining his eyes for a sight of the game; the water gleaming in the fierce light, and the dark ranks of cedars all around."

Topical Architecture: A Library of Classified Architectural Motives and Details. Edited by William Rotch Ware, Fellow of the Boston Society of Architects. Boston: American Architect and Building News Company. Renaissance Doorways: Italian, I. (1901). Door and Window Grilles in Bronze and Iron, I. (1902).

Two parts have reached us of the above work, but there is no statement as to whether these are Parts I. and II. of the whole work, or whether others have appeared already. We are therefore unable to inform the reader how far this work may be expected to go. Each volume before us is a collection of plates without text, and with legends merely sufficient to give locality, name of building, and sometimes date or approximate date. Thus, we have, "Doorway leading to the Sacristy, Badia di Fiesole. [1462.] Brunelleschi, Architect," and, in another case, "Doorway to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Palazzo Brignole, Genoa. Galeazzo Alessi, Architect"; the first of the plates so named being a half-tone print, the second a reproduction from a print in line and credited to the *Revue Générale de l'Architecture*. Some of the doorways are shown in full front—that is, in photographs taken exactly opposite the axis of the design, or by reproduction from elevation drawings; others, though probably the minority, are very picturesque drawings made in the artistic way, or, if wholly photographic, then from a point of view which gives more interesting results. It is, however, with deliberate purpose, no doubt, that the more formal way of presentation is chosen. The chief utility of such books as these is to draughtsmen in offices, nor can there be any doubt that those gentlemen prefer the front view, upon which they can apply their dividers without the trouble of making mental calculations as to the true significance of the details before them.

In what we have said, we have dealt only with the book on doorways. The metal gratings show a more diversified scheme, for some of them are modern and some are ancient; some are on a large scale, and occasionally there are two or even five in a plate; some are in pure photography, and others are photographic copies from outline prints. It need hardly be explained that some of the pieces are very commonplace indeed. Fortunately, it is also true that some there are which have a peculiar charm, and even the great merit of being well and originally designed light metal work.

It is right to say of the books that, although there is no text, there is a two-fold table of contents; the one part managed as an index by location (as Berlin, Prussia, with two specimens; London, England, with four; New York, with perhaps thirty), and the other an index by authorship—that is to say, by the names of the architects who are the designers (as Clinton & Russell with five plates; McKim, Mead & White with five plates; the majority with one plate each). We have tried to describe exactly these books for the benefit of possible purchasers, and the description of a folio of miscellaneous examples hardly allows of much enthusiastic praise. It is quite evident that the books will be of great value for those to whose use they are especially devoted.

Les Syndicats Industriels de Producteurs en France et à l'Etranger. Par Paul de Rousiers. Paris: Armand Colin. 1901. Pp. viii, 290.

The author of this volume is well known in France as a student of American and English industrial conditions, for he has already published several trustworthy works in that field. The present one is a comparative study of industrial combinations, and is divided into three roughly equal parts, dealing respectively with the United States, Germany, and France. M. de Rousiers investigated our own Trusts during a visit to this country in 1896. During 1899 and 1900, he examined German combinations, and, in 1901, studied the French selling-pools. In discussing industrial development outside his own country, he is probably better informed than most foreigners who have taken up the subject, and his work is entitled to respect, although every one who reads it is likely to feel that it is more instructive upon foreign conditions than upon those prevailing in the reader's own country. We think that this is particularly true of the sections relating to the United States. M. de Rousiers has availed himself of most of the recent sources of information, like the work of the Industrial Commission, and has read all the recent books on the subject—such as those of Jenks, Ely, and others. Despite this careful study, he sometimes strays rather far away from his material. The discussions of French and German conditions give the same impression. As a whole, the volume is distinctly sketchy.

M. de Rousiers analyzes the nature and organization of the principal combinations in the three countries of which he treats. He finds that the chief differences between them lie in the extent to which industries have been concentrated, and in the degree of ruthlessness with which consolidation has been brought about. The United States is regarded as the extreme type of concentration in industry. Its Trusts have been formed for the sake of industrial domination; their managers have not hesitated to trample rivals under foot, and the private ownership of railways has enabled large producers to get illegitimate advantage in the shape of discriminating freight rates. Conditions in Germany have been less trying for the small producer. While it is true that the principle of monopoly has been recognized by the Government, some Trusts being directly supported by it, there has been far less effort to exclude the small manufacturer from the market. The consolidations have been unions of producers at the expense of the consuming class, and their main end has been to limit output and so maintain prices at a point that may be profitable for all. In France, most combinations have aimed simply at certain economies of production and distribution and at an equitable division of business. In all three countries, however, M. de Rousiers recognizes the existence of certain tariff Trusts which control special lines of production through Government favor, without any of the reasons for existence that prevail in other industries.

The author is weakest when he deals with the combinations from a theoretical standpoint. The only explanation of the existence of the Trust that he gives is that "industrial and commercial concentration, necessitated by modern economic evolution, compels those who are engaged in industry to draw closer and to unite their efforts in order to rise superior to new tendencies." As Gen. Walker once said, "Some evolutionists ought to be hanged." What is needed in the discussion of the Trust problem is not a mere reference to evolution as the "cause" of the Trust, but some clear indication of the industrial result to be expected from the combinations and of the changes they are likely to introduce into economic theory. About all that M. de Rousiers has to offer on this aspect of the question is the well-worn observation that the combinations do no harm so long as they confine themselves to industrial affairs and hold aloof from political activity.

Prisoners of Russia. By Benjamin Howard, M.A., M.D., etc. D. Appleton & Co. 1902.

Those who, some five or six years ago, in this city, heard the late Dr. Howard lecture on his "personal study of convict life in Sakhalin and Siberia," or have read the lecture in the Proceedings of the American Geographical Society, are already acquainted with the admirable spirit of fairness, sympathy, and common sense which distinguishes this volume from many others on allied subjects. Dr. Howard's long familiarity with prison problems in other countries also rendered him eminently qualified to pronounce with authority on the merits and demerits of the Russian exile system, which is seen in its worst representatives in Sakhalin, to which this work is mainly devoted. He, in common with some of Great Britain's Fenian ex-prisoners (whose comments on this subject we printed a number of years ago), regards the Russian system, with its principle of making use of the criminal for the good of the State, allowing him comparative freedom and exercise, with the ultimate prospect of a free life, as infinitely superior to any system in vogue in other lands. He makes a strong argument from the conditions formerly prevailing in Australia, and the effect upon the moral character of prisoners in somewhat similar circumstances. There is some repetition on this point and a few others, indicating that his chapters originally figured as separate lectures or articles.

Revision in this respect, and in regard to the Russian quoted, would have improved the volume as to literary quality and accuracy. The author also falls into errors when he makes statements about the rites of the Eastern Catholic Church, such as, that the children receive the Holy Communion in advance of the priests; that little white loaves, with spear-shaped incisions, are purchased after the morning service by the congregation at will; that it is a rare and unusual thing (so much so that he had never met a foreigner who had had the experience) to see the various services connected with baptism, chrismation, and ablution on the eighth day, "all, and in their proper order of succession, on a single occasion," together with the "Prayers for a Woman on the Fortieth Day after the Birth of a Child" (corresponding to the "Thanksgiving of Women after Child-birth" in the Anglican-Episcopal Church); and, most astounding of all, that the "Athanasian Creed, according exactly to the English version," is recited during one of these services. As to these statements, it may be said that the Athanasian Creed is absolutely unknown, in any form whatever, to the Eastern Catholic Church, the sole one in use being that of Nicea-Constantinople; that the priests invariably communicate first, although in some places (chiefly in the Greek branch) children under seven years of age are given the bread and wine before consecration, which is probably what Dr. Howard saw; and that the first three rites above mentioned, originally separate, are now performed in immediate succession, and can be seen almost any Sunday in the year, even in the Russian churches in various American cities; while the last is equally frequent, though not generally performed at the conclusion of the others. The little loaves, moreover, have been purchased before the service (not at the end), and spear-shaped particles

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been removed by the priest in the sanctuary, accompanied by prayers for the health of the living or the repose of the dead persons indicated by the purchasers, who merely receive back their loaves at the end of the service. Hence, Dr. Howard here misses the import of the custom as well.

Dr. Howard is under the impression that no work exists, in any language, on the subject of Sakhalin, by any person who has ever actually lived there. In this he is mistaken; a fine one does exist, by a "political," who lived there for years, and who even sets forth, in plain language, the affair at Onor to which Dr. Howard alludes by a quotation from an English newspaper of 1892. He is also mistaken—obviously so, in the light of this last fact cited—in his remark: "As the result of my inquiries, not only in Sakhalin itself, but in various parts of Russia as well, I came to think that it is rather the policy of the Russian Government to discourage any definite information about Sakhalin from reaching the Russian people"—and so forth. Yet the ex-political's book above mentioned was licensed, pictures and all, by the censor!

On the whole, however, Dr. Howard's book should be read by every person who is interested in Russia, or in prison problems (and he makes valuable suggestions on other points as well). It is delightful in style, and inspires one with a high and affectionate regard for the man who could write such an impartial, eminently practical work.

Tetraeuangelium sanctum juxta simplicem Syrorum versionem ad fidem codicum, massoræ, editionium denuo recognitum. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: H. Frowde. Pp. xvi, 608.

The *editio princeps* of the New Testament in Syriac appeared at Vienna in 1555. Less than forty years had passed since the *editio princeps* of the Greek text had seen the light; now this new venture came to add its element to the breaking up of old things which Erasmus had wrought. The unmatched authority of the Vulgate had been blown down the wind; was the Greek original in its turn to yield to something still more original? That Widmanstadt, the editor of the Syriac, had any clear idea on this may not be certain; it is certain from his rambling preface, full of strange learning mixed with personal history, that he felt himself launching out on an unknown sea of vague possibilities. He did not belong to the first fresh dawn of humanism, either Latin or Greek, but to that later time when the world was opening east and west, and the Orient was beginning again to pour its treasures on Europe. The place of Greek fugitives as teachers of new lore was taken for him by Syrian Christians in the schools at Rome. Names on his lips are those of Magellan, Reuchlin, Ximenes, Pico de Mirandola, Leo Africanus—above all, Theseus Ambrosius, the first of Syriac scholars in Europe. Of his meeting with the last and the inspiration gained from him for this edition, he gives a vivid account. It was the Oriental renaissance. And thus it is not strange that the conception of Syriac as the native tongue of Jesus should have haunted him; so he had learned to think of it from his Maronite teachers. He had clearly grasped the modern position that a sound exegesis and understanding of the Gospels must be based on an appreciation of the fact that their ultimate sources, written or oral, were Aramaic; that the life in them had been lived in an Aramaic atmosphere.

The *editio princeps* was followed by others in rapid succession; there were at least seven more in the sixteenth century. But neither then nor until now was there one which could claim to present a new and critical text. The sources of the editions of Urmia and Mosul, which came closest to this, were unknown, and these editions could rank only as single and probably good MSS. To all appearance, the Widmanstadt text had come to be regarded as a sufficiently faithful reproduction of the original Peshita, the accepted version of the ancient Syriac Church.

It took the great critical controversy over the Greek text itself, which culminated in the edition of Westcott and Hort, to shake this trust. The Syriac accepted text agreed most closely with the "received" Greek text, and disagreed most strikingly with the now reconstructed critical text. Did, then, this Syriac text actually represent the text received by the Syriac Church in the fourth century and earlier, or had it been corrupted in process of time as was alleged to have befallen the Greek text? So stood the problem. The defenders of the *textus receptus*, notably Dean Burgon, buttressed themselves with the Syriac, and branded the Westcott and Hort text as the most corrupt ever printed. To maintain this position and to resolve the question, an elaborate critical edition of the Gospels was planned by the late Philip Edward Pusey. He had collated many MSS. and collected much material when, in 1880, his lamented death intervened. Thereafter the work was taken up by the present editor, George Henry Gwilliam. He has made use of forty-one MSS., ranging from copies of the fifth century down, of the Urmia edition and of the Nestorian Massoretic MSS. His result, which can hardly be impugned, may be given in his own words: "We can demonstrate that the Peshitto version of the Gospels has not been corrupted in later times; but, on the contrary, that whatsoever variations it exhibits from the Greek, date from a most remote antiquity. Our authorities are products of both the great schools of Syriac Christianity, while our most ancient copies connect our readings with those of the undivided Syriac Church." The fixed fact, then, appears to be that the Syriac version crystallized much earlier than did the Greek text, and, since that crystallization, has been handed on with a unity of recension which reminds most of all of the Massoretic text of the Old Testament; further, that this crystallized form, existing certainly in the fifth century, was in close agreement with the Greek *textus receptus*. Mr. Gwilliam would be inclined to go much further, but so far there can be no disputing his results.

Yet this simply raises new problems. We have now got the ecclesiastical text of the ancient Syriac Church. What relation does it bear to the Curetonian MS., to the Sinaitic MS., to the version used by Aphraates, to the old Latin version, and to the Codex Bezæ? Here be questions! The fountains of the great deep, which were thought effectively and finally sealed by Westcott and Hort, are broken up again, and those who followed in the forlorn hope of Dean Burgon are meeting with their reward. It may not turn out to be precisely what they expect or want, but it was no mare's-nest which they found.

Of Mr. Gwilliam's present edition it is hard to speak in other terms than of the most absolute praise. He has executed his task admirably, and it is in the hope that he is now at work on the remainder of the New Testament that we would venture the following criticisms. The Latin version—added for the benefit of theologians who do not know Syriac, and of these there should be none—is too literal. It will often mislead the non-Syriac reader as to what the Syriac really means. Next, the chapters should be indicated on each page; at present, only luck or patience enables the reader to find his place. Again, the proof-reading of the Syriac could be more careful. But that is a thorny subject; in proof-reading the heart knoweth its own bitterness. The annotations, too, contain an excellent *apparatus criticus*, but there is also in them a number of notes, grammatical and otherwise, which would perhaps be better away. The user of this edition may be presumed to know his Syriac grammar and such matters as differences of spelling between Jacobites and Nestorians. But all these are little things, and we leave this edition with an expression of renewed hope that it may soon be completed.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Budge, E. A. W. Egypt in the Neolithic and Archaic Periods. H. Frowde.
Hutton, Edward. Studies in the Lives of the Saints. London: Archibald Constable & Co.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.25.
Purser, L. C. M. Tullii Ciceronis Epistolae, Vol. III. Henry Frowde. 2s. 6d.
Woodward, R. P. On a Donkey's Hurricane Deck. I. H. Blanchard Co.

The Nation, *The Bookbuyer, The Dial, The Times' Saturday Review, The Tribune, The Outlook, Life, Public Opinion, The Literary World, The Brooklyn Eagle, The Chicago Post, and The Philadelphia Times,* are some of the leading authorities that praise Miss Godfrey's Romance,

THE WINDING ROAD

(Circular on application.)

Henry Holt & Co. 29 W. 23d St. New York.

Nature Study and Life

By CLIFTON F. HODGE of Clark University.

"It is not too strong praise to say that this is an epoch making book, and should find its way into every home as well as school."—J. R. STREET of Syracuse University in *Journal of Pedagogy*, June, 1902.

GINN & COMPANY, Publishers,
Boston New York Chicago London

Chickering Pianos

The OLDEST *in* AMERICA; THE BEST *in the* WORLD

WRITE FOR CATALOGUE.

Chickering & Sons

PIANO FORTE MAKERS

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED